The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXII, No. 4 APRIL, 1950

CONTENTS

Our Lady Queen of Apostles
Archbishop Richard J. Cushing 241

Some Street Shrines of Rome. Part III
Bishop John Wright 246

The Minister's Intention in Baptism . *Ulric Beste, O.S.B.* 257

Defamation: "The Sin in Loving Virtue"
Francis J. McGarrigle, S.J. 275

The Opening of the Holy Door . . . . *Antonio Caretta* 287

The Independence of St. Ambrose . *Thomas Owen Martin* 289

The Parish Census-List and Membership in the True Church
Joseph Clifford Fenton 300

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Preparing for a Mixed Marriage 312

The Privilege of the Little Office 312

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Position of the Sub-Deacon at the *Sanctus* 313

Blessing when taking Holy Communion to the Sick . . 314

Benedictio post partum in the plural 314

The *Asperges* in a Semi-Public Oratory 314

BOOK REVIEWS

God the Father: Meditations, *by Archbishop Guerry* . . 316

Vademecum theologiae moralis, 6th edition, *by Dominic M. Prummer, O.P.* 317

Secrets of the Interior Life, *by Archbishop Martinez* . . 318

As We Ought, *by Vincent P. McCorry, S.J.* 319

WHY . . . . *you should consider*

THE HOLY LAND ART COMPANY

When in need of vestments or material for vestments can be simply stated in these words:

YOU MAY CHOOSE excellent Gothic or Roman vestments, *for immediate delivery*, from a large stock, made by our own skilled needleworkers in this country; or

YOU MAY SELECT beautiful vestments from samples on display at our store and have them made abroad especially for you; also

YOU MAY PURCHASE, by the yard, at our store, superb brocades, damasks, orphreys and appliques, either domestic or imported; and

YOU MAY BE SURE of getting at the Holy Land Art Company correct liturgical designs and colors at the lowest possible prices consistent with the high quality of our products.

TO: HOLY LAND ART CO.
55 BARCLAY STREET, NEW YORK 7, N. Y.
Please send me:
☐ Information about Vestments
☐ Samples of Materials. (Please state color desired.)
Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone .....
State .....

You are invited to visit us or mail the coupon stating your requirements

Holy Land Art Co.
Est. 1922
ALPHONSE TONIETTI
Now With
Bernardini Studios
55 Barclay Street
New York 7, N. Y.
Telephone WOrth 2-2130

OUR LADY QUEEN OF APOSTLES

The picture conjured up in devout imagination by the title "Queen of the Apostles" is that of the Blessed Mother surrounded by the faithful company of Jesus in the Cenacle at the moment of the descent of the Holy Ghost. Together with the apostles themselves, Mary participates in the birth of the Infant Church. The Pentecostal fire, which illumines their minds and gives ardor to their speech, somehow communicates itself also to Mary, and to her superabundant graces there are now added new dignities, new privileges and new powers which are apostolic in their nature and effects.

Peter is the Prince of the Apostles, their visible chief, the Vicar of their Christ. But Mary, too, enjoys a primacy all her own. She is the Queen of Apostles, their heart, the Mother of Christ and, therefore, in a sense, the channel of their apostolic graces as well as the graces of their redemption.

Mary is Queen, too, of all others who in any sense share the apostolate of Christ and His Church. That means that she is the Queen also of our lay apostles, of those who in every walk of life, within each social class, defend the rights of God, proclaim His Truth, preach His eternal Will. As the Queen of these lay apostles, Mary is at once a channel of the grace by which they accomplish their apostolate and an example of the virtues needed in order for them to do so.

Those virtues are *joyous zeal for God and for souls, and a warm love for divine learning.* The lay apostle must have a *will* inflamed with the desire that *God's* Will be done and a *mind* steeped in the knowledge of what that Will is. Queen of Apostles, Mary is the highest human exemplar of these twin virtues.

The proofs of this are innumerable. The best and the most beautiful in her *Magnificat:* the battle-cry of the true apostle, his paean of praise, his hymn of hope. I offer for your meditation the *Magnificat* and for your imitation Mary of the *Magnificat,* Queen of Lay Apostles.

You and I are used to hearing this glorious canticle in Latin or in English. In both languages it has a magnificent cadence, a majestic, poetic beauty. Let me just repeat for the delight of your ears and the warming of your hearts a few of its stirring lines:

Magnificat anima mea Dominum. Et exultavit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo . . .
Quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est: et sanctum nomen ejus . . .
Fecit potentiam in brachio suo: dispersit superbos mente cordis sui . . .
Esurientes implevit bonis, et divites dimisit inanes.
Suscepit Israel Puerum suum, recordatus misericordiae suae.
Sicut locutus est ad patres nostros: Abraham, et semini ejus in saecula.

My soul doth magnify: the Lord. And my spirit rejoiceth: in God my Saviour.
Because He hath looked down on the lowliness of His handmaid: for behold henceforth all generations will call me blessed.
Because the Mighty One hath done great things for me: and holy is His Name.
And His mercy is from generation to generation: on those who fear Him.
He showeth might in His arm: He scattereth the proud in the conceit of their heart.
He casteth down the mighty from their throne: and exalteth the lowly.
He filleth the hungry with good things: and the rich He sendeth away empty.
He hath received His servant Israel: being mindful of His mercy.
As He spoke to our fathers: to Abraham and to his seed for ever.

Remember, we possess in this great Latin and English poetry not the original, but only translations of translations. Mary uttered her passionate poem of praise in Aramaic. It comes to us translated through Greek, the language of Saint Luke. Saint Luke's Greek comes to us translated into Latin and from Latin into English. It is easy to appreciate how much of the music and the might of Mary's poem must have been lost in this process of successive translations.

And yet so overwhelming is the thought, so exalted the theme that even in translation four times removed from the original,

the words of the Magnificat thrill us by their power. They proclaim to us the twin virtues which must characterize the apostle and which are supremely present in the Queen of the Apostles: *joyful zeal for God's majesty and for the salvation of souls, a love for sacred learning and divine wisdom.*

Joy in the service of God and in the salvation of souls is the recurring theme in the symphony of Mary's *Magnificat, My soul doth magnify*—proclaim the greatness of—*the Lord. My spirit rejoices—exults* in Him. The happiness of what I am doing shall never die. My generation may pass—but *all generations will call me blessed.* The words pour forth unchecked in joy. The song, as always in the heart of the apostle, is one of *victory*—of visions realized and dreams fulfilled: *for he that is mighty hath done great things to me.*

Joy—joyful zeal—happiness in the doings of *God's work:* this is the characteristic of the apostle. It is what most we need. It is the great theme of the *Magnificat,* song of the Queen of Apostles.

The object of the apostles' zeal is Gods' *majesty: holy and terrible is His name.* But it is also *the good of souls:* that God's mercy may reach them, from generation to generation; that God's bounty may fill them, nor let them be sent away empty; that God's justice may rule them in fulfillment of His promise which He gave to our fathers, to Abraham and his seed forever! And out of the apostles' confidence in all this comes one great, sustaining spirit: the spirit of *Joy, Joy in the work, Joy in the Lord: Magnificat.*

These are things of the heart. They are the virtues which strengthen the *will* of the apostle and feed his *zeal* to achieve for God. But no less needed are the virtues of the mind, those which store and discipline his intellect.

Mary's *Magnificat* reveals a mind steeped in the sacred writings of her people—the history, the prophecies, the poetry of Israel, and all in terms of the relation of these to God and of God to them. The phrases of her poem echo the great lines of the Old Testament which record the highest moments of Hebrew history. This great *Te Deum* comes from the abundance of a *heart* aflame with zeal—but it is also the work of a *mind* alive with learning and the love for divine wisdom.

Mary prepared for her apostolate by prayer, but also by meditation and study. It was the study of *sacred writings* which taught her the promises of God to Israel. It was the study of *life* which taught her all the pathos, the perplexity, the cross-purposes and frustrations of the people, of Israel *without* the promises.

It was the study of *life* that gave her an alert and sensitive knowledge of the callousness of the strong, the humility of the weak, the conceit of the "haves," the fears of the "have nots." It was the study of *sacred writings* which taught her the wealth of examples of God's dealings with men. They knew the story of Pharaoh of Egypt, Sennacherib of Assyria, Nabuchodonosor of Babylon, Antiochus of Syria—mighty monarchs all, proud ones of the earth whom God had scattered. Esther the humble, preferred to Vashti the proud; her story also Mary had meditated and from it had drawn the rich wisdom of the apostle, who stands before the indifferent and the proud sustained by his knowledge that, even as of old, so now and forever God's victory is certain, final and decisive.

> . . . he scattereth the proud in the conceit of their heart.
> He casteth down the mighty from their throne: and exalteth the lowly.
> He filleth the hungry with good things: and the rich He sendeth away empty.

These are the words of a woman who had prepared for her apostolate by shrewdly watching the ways of the world. She had observed how the subjects of an Eastern king did not approach their sovereign with empty hands: they presented rich gifts to win his favor. In turn the typical Eastern monarch did not allow himself to be outdone in generosity; he bestowed liberal rewards on his favorites. His humbler subjects could not afford costly gifts and so could not "get in." Mary had seen this times beyond number.

But she had also seen that with *God* it is different—and that knowledge underlies the wisdom which is the secret and the spur of the Apostle. To know the ways of the world—but to meet them with better ways, better and wiser and more effective. To understand the ways of men—but to act with the wisdom of God. To apply the lessons learned of *life* and of *study*—but apply them

God's way: all this is the work of the apostle, and of this work Our Lady is the great exemplar. Her *Magnifcat* sings the joy and the wisdom of all apostles, the informed enthusiasm which I pray will be *yours.*

Queen of Apostles, pray for us! Pray for the Church at whose birth you were present! Pray for the Church of whose apostles you were the companion in perseverance and in prayer! Pray for the Church which is the Mystical Body of that Christ whose physical Body was fashioned of your flesh! Pray for us who hold the place of the apostles in this century, who strive to do their work, who lack so many of their graces but must somehow accomplish a task like to theirs; Give us *enthusiasm* and *joy* in the knowledge, the love and service of the Lord. Queen of Apostles, pray for us all!

✠ Richard J. Cushing, D.D.
Archbishop of Boston

The Authority of Christ and of His Church

By the law of Christ we mean not merely the natural precepts of morality, or what supernatural knowledge the ancient world acquired, all of which Jesus Christ perfected and raised to the highest plane by His explanation, interpretation, and ratification; but we mean, besides, all the doctrine and in particular the institutions He has left us. Of these the Church is the chief. Indeed, what institution of Christ is there that she does not fully embrace and include? By the ministry of the Church, so gloriously founded by Him, He willed to perpetuate the office assigned to Him by His Father, and having on the one hand conferred upon her all effectual aids for human salvation, He ordained with the utmost emphasis on the other that men should be subject to her as to Himself, and zealously follow her guidance in every department of life: "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." So the law of Christ is always to be sought from the Church, and therefore as Christ is for man the way, so likewise the Church is the way. He in Himself and by His proper nature, she by His commission and by a share in His power. On this account those who would strive for salvation apart from the Church, wander from the way and are struggling in vain.

—Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Tametsi,* issued Nov. 1, 1900.

SOME STREET SHRINES OF ROME

Part III

"le cappelle"

We have already recalled in these Holy Year notes some of the street shrines of Rome which have long since been translated into nearby churches for more systematic care and supervised cult. Typical of these, as noted in our first instalment of notes, may be mentioned the *Madonna della Strada,* venerated in the Gesù, the renowned church of the Jesuit Fathers.

A group apart among the street shrines are those which are enshrined in wayside chapels of their own, *cappelle* erected usually under private auspices or through the devotion of confraternities of a local and popular kind. Traditionally beloved by the Roman people are five wayside chapels dedicated to the Blessed Mother: the madonnas *dell' Arco Oscuro, del Soccorso, del Buon Consiglio, del Divino Amore* and *dell' Archetto.*

The chapel of the *Madonna dell' Arco Oscuro* is located in Villa Giulia beneath an ancient passageway, recently closed, which was called the *arco oscuro* because of its darkness and associations. The precincts of the passageway were the object of the well-founded fears of wayfarers, and many and lurid were the tales of violence and peril at the hands of outlaws told of the *arco oscuro.*

An image of the Blessed Mother was erected for veneration in the shadows of the dark passage and straightway edifying accounts of deliverances from evil as well as conversions to grace began to compete in number and drama with the whispered tales of evil. Those whom business brought into the neighborhood of the Dark Arch became the devout clients of the *Madonna dell'Arco Oscuro.* In the last decade of the eighteenth century the shrine became the particular charge of a hermit, Fra Giovanni, who undertook to provide for its shelter a worthy chapel, the origins of which are commemorated in an inscription still to be seen on the inner wall.

Parsi quotes a daybook of the ordinariate wherein are described the circumstances of the completion of the chapel. Apparently Fra Giovanni did with his own hands the initial work of building and beautifying the shrine. Contributions were speedily forthcom-

ing once the work was underway, and apparently the workers in the vineyards nearby were foremost among the benefactors. The zealous interest of the parish priest of *S. Maria del Popolo,* within whose jurisdiction the region lies, made possible a temporary transfer of the image to that historic church while the work was in progress and also a particularly impressive blessing of the finished chapel on Dec. 7, 1797.

On the vigil of Christmas, 1797 (a Sunday), a solemn procession from *S. Maria del Popolo* escorted the picture of the Madonna back to its proper place in the *arco oscuro.* The contemporary report speaks of the length and erudition of the pastor's sermon, delivered from a pulpit erected outside the new chapel. It records how many and fervent were the litanies chanted and the hymns sung, nor does it neglect to mention a concert of wind instruments provided by a Roman band which had enlivened yet more the popular procession. The blessing with a relic of the Virgin, followed by a display of fireworks, terminated the era of dark deeds associated with the passageway and inaugurated the pacific reign of the Madonna over the isolated, lonely region.

The following morning a Solemn Mass was sung before the shrine, the first Mass to be offered in the new *cappella.* Fra Giovanni, greatly encouraged in his work by this popular and official patronage, pressed for further embellishments of the chapel. Distinguished Roman citizens, foremost among them the Duchess Braschi, so generously furnished the little sanctuary that in the early part of the nineteenth century it was a jewel of Roman homage to the Blessed Mother.

In more recent years the passageway of the *arco oscuro* was closed, but the chapel of the Madonna still stands. Its entrance is closed by massive iron gates and the interior is neglected and damp. Sadly faded images of saints still relieve the bareness of the walls, as do a number of votive gifts, among them an old pistol and a crutch. Over the altar a cheap reproduction of the original image is displayed in a tawdry frame as if to preserve by prescription the rights of the *Madonna dell' Arco Oscuro* to her place in Villa Giulia. The original, the Madonna holding her Child with St. Joseph by her side, has been temporarily removed to a nearby home lest it deteriorate even further and pending a possible restoration of the chapel.

Sometime after the middle of the eighteenth century (perhaps shortly after 1759) the Roman public institution for charitable loans, the famed *Monte di Pietà,* erected the chapel of the *Madonna del Soccorso* in Via Giovanni Berta. The shrine was doubtless intended to pay homage to the Blessed Mother under a title appropriate to work of the sponsoring patrons and consistent with the errands which brought so many destitute into the streets around the *Monte di Pietà.*

The chapel closes a blind alley hard by the headquarters of the charitable loan association as these were enlarged in 1759. The original image is now venerated at the side altar of Saint Matthew in the nearby church of the *Trinità dei Pellegrini,* whither it was removed as a result of the vandalism so flagrant in the period 1870-80. A copy of the Madonna, a Virgin with Child, one arm lifted in blessing, has been enshrined in the *capella* since the 1890s when the *Monte di Pietà* restored and enlarged the chapel after a period of abandonment identified with the disorders mentioned.

It is easy to distinguish the features added to the chapel at the end of the nineteenth century from the essential aspects present since the beginning. Save for the difference in the actual image and for the disappearance of the two side canvasses and the outside kneelers, the wayside chapel may still be recognized from the description written in 1853 by Rufini (*Indicazione delle immagini di Maria SS.ma collocate sulle mura esterne di taluni edifici dell' alma città di Roma*) :

> Under the arch of the *Monte di Pietà* there is a small chapel restored in this current year with paintings, stuccos, golden and other decorations. Over the large cornice one reads—*Sancta Maria Succurre Miseris*—and the whole is covered by a small wooden ceiling. In the inside turn there is painted the holy name of Mary. There is also a small altar of marble and, sustained by stucco seraphim, a canvas image of *Maria Santissima del Soccorso* with the Divine Child in her arms. Both heads are adorned with small silver crowns. Over the frame there are three stucco cherubs in adoration. On the side walls may be seen two canvases which represent the *Adoration of the Magi* and the *Presentation in the Temple.* Within the chapel are found two marble kneelers; two similar ones are found outside. Rich gifts give token of the special devotion of the faithful. The chapel is guarded by iron gates.

In Via Tor de' Conti, in front of the walls that circle the Forum of Augustus there was built in 1834 a chapel in honor of the *Madonna del Buon Consiglio.* This chapel was built through the generosity of the Sturbinetti family whose properties in that district were crossed by a narrow road considered very dangerous and unpleasant, especially at night. The family eventually obtained permission to close the road and to erect a wayside chapel for the public veneration of a Madonna hitherto privately cherished in their home.

The chapel is closed by an iron gate and in the frieze of the neoclassic portal is inscribed the title, *Mater Boni Consilii.* On one side there still remains a marble slab with a petition for alms to replenish with oil the lamp before the Madonna.

In recent times the interior has been reduced in height and the chapel has thereby lost its earlier dignity, being now somehow stunted in appearance. The walls are bare and bleached. In the center background is a small altar and a richly carved wooden recess containing a canvas dating from the end of the eighteenth or the beginning of the nineteenth century. It reproduces a delicate likeness of the Mother of Good Counsel.

To one side may be seen a large crucifix and a small statue of St. Anthony. Two kneelers are provided before the altar. On a side wall there is the following inscription: "In onore della miracolosa Vergine del Buon Consiglio i benefattori fedeli raccolgono la di lei festa con omaggio e devozione il 26 maggio 1884, primo cinquantesimo in cui fu messa in questa veneranda cappella. —Il custode Amadio Paoloni."

A stone slab records the indulgences attached to this chapel by Pope Gregory XVI in a decree of June 11, 1834. Its unusual spiritual privileges enhanced popular esteem for the *cappella* of the *Madonna del Buon Consiglio,* and until very recent years it was constantly adorned with *ex-voti* left by innumerable devout clients.

Two of the Madonnas enshrined in their own wayside chapels are identified with the strange happenings of July 9, 1796 among *le madonnelle* of Rome. In our second instalment of these notes we mentioned the case of the *Madonna dell' Archetto,* and to this particularly hallowed shrine we must shortly return. The same

fateful date features in the history of the *Madonna del Divino Amore.*

This wayside shrine in Via dei Prefetti will not, of course, be confused with the shrine of the *Madonna del Divino Amore* in the Roman *campagna* to which so many tens of thousands come in pilgrimage from the *castelli Romani* and from Rome itself each year at Pentecost. The latter sanctuary, familiar to alumni of the North American College, is strangely majestic in its primitive simplicity, a supernatural oasis in the rude wastes of the *campagna.*

In his account written in 1853 Rufini mentions the *cappella* in Via dei Prefetti as being "under the madhouse attached to Rome's lunatic asylum . . . . a small shrine with an iron gate where one may venerate an image of the Madonna under the title of Divine Love."

The application of this mystic title of Our Lady to the present image appears to be due to the patronage of the original shrine by a pious group which flourished in Rome during the early sixteenth century, the so-called "Company of Divine Love." The devout confraternity held its meetings in the parish church of S. Nicolà dei Prefetti, and the shrine in all probability takes its name from association with them.

The chapel itself is unadorned, but the principal feature, the canvas of the Madonna, is of more than usual artistic interest. A seventeenth century painting, it has even been attributed to Sassoferrato and is certainly the work of an accomplished craftsman. The figure of Mary is represented at half-bust; the colorings (rose and azure dominate) are good, and a genuine spirit of recollection in prayer is achieved by such details as the lowered eyes, the serene countenance and the gently folded hands of the Madonna.

A modern marble altar and a profusion of *ex-voti,* together with an unduly ornate "sunburst," set off the image itself which, as we have remarked, was reported by many faithful as reproducing the phenomena of the movement of the eyes on July 9, 1796. No official confirmation of these particular claims, however, was made in the subsequent vicariate decree concerning other shrines in the city.

More fortunate in the results of its canonical investigation in 1796 and by all odds the most popular and faithfully preserved of Roman *cappelle* is that of the *Madonna dell' Archetto.* There is

probably no priest educated at the nearby North American College who has not at one time or another in his student days joined with the curious little group of devout Romans who assemble in this chapel at stated hours and seasons for litanies to the Blessed Mother "of the small arch."

The image venerated in this uniquely beautiful shrine dates from sometime around 1690. It is painted in oil on tile and is the work of a Bolognese artist, Domenico Muratori, of the school of Caracci. It was originally commissioned by Marchesa Alessandra Millini Muti Savorelli Papazzuri who desired a copy of a Madonna in the convent of the Cappuccine delle Barberine.

Muratori's copy was placed within a niche under an archway between the Palazzo Casati and an adjoining religious house in an alley connecting Via di S. Marcello with Via dell' Archetto. From the name of the latter narrow street the crowded neighborhood and its beloved shrine both take their local names.

From the first days of its erection in the alley by Palazzo Casati this privileged *madonnella* was destined to play a conspicuous part in the popular religious life of Rome. By the middle of the eighteenth century devotion to this street shrine had so flourished that it seemed wise to public authorities to erect iron gates at each end of the passage-way. These were closed each evening after *Ave Maria* in order to protect by night the accumulation of precious *ex-voti* surrounding the image of Mary.

In 1751 the niche protecting the painting was considerably embellished by the plasterer Ferrari and the sculptor Grassi with offerings contributed by the thousands of pious persons who regularly visited the *Madonna dell' Archetto* at all hours, in all times over a period of years.

It was probably no surprise to the Roman people to learn that the first of the street-shrine prodigies reported in the city July 9, 1796, was connected with the *Madonna dell' Archetto.* Parsi reprints an eyewitness account of these first extraordinary occurences. It was related by a certain Antonio Ambrosini who chanced to pass through the neighborhood at about noontime of that eventful day. He heard some one assert that the eyes of the nearby image of the Madonna had been seen to close and to reopen in unmistakable fashion.

Ambrosini betook himself immediately to the shrine and found

it still possible, the report having not yet spread, to examine the picture closely and carefully. A few other citizens were standing close by him, minutely observing the features of the Madonna, when suddenly Ambrosini was rewarded with a stupendous spectacle concerning which he later made the following sworn deposition:

> I observed that no longer could the light be seen from both eyes, but that unmistakably the upper lid had lowered and united with the lower eyelid, so that it presented a perfect closing of the eyes. I confess that in truth I was so shaken that I thought the distance was deceiving me and that my eyes were seeing imperfectly. Wherefore I took particular care to check my faculties of sight and I quickly placed my hands on my own eyes. I closed these for a very brief moment, and then once again I reopened them, fixing them on the eyes of *Maria Santissima.* I then saw very well that these continued to remain shut, but in the next instant they opened and the upper eyelids returned to their place so that once again I saw the light from those holy eyes. And this movement of the eyes was so visible and so clear that I cannot describe it better than by saying that the holy image made a very wide opening of its eyes. Upon beholding such a marvel I could not refrain from lifting my voice and I gave out a very loud cry. I cannot recall the words I said inasmuch as my being was so completely shaken and my body "frozen"; at the same time I was so stirred that spontaneous tears came to my eyes. Cries similar to mine came from the few people who were present, since they, too, were witnesses to the same miracle as I saw. As soon as the wonder became known, crowds began to come and this continued for weeks and months. From the first sign of dawn until late at night crowds gathered in such manner as to require a military guard in many places and as all Rome knew, throughout July and a good part of August it was necessary to restrain the people in the one direction as far as the corner of Piazza S. Apostoli, and in the other direction as far as the *Oratorio di S. Marcello,* so that with good order everyone succeeded in approaching, little by little, the Arch.

One of the principal witnesses heard in the eventual canonical process conducted by the Vicariate was Fra Giovenale Goani of the Franciscan Conventuals in nearby Santi Apostoli. Skeptical of the reports he had heard concerning the "miracle," he visited the shrine, only to change his opinion.

Again we are indebted to Parsi for an eye witness report, this time as given by Fra Giovenale:

I remained in the same place, determined to stay for three or four hours so that I might attest that however long a time I stayed I could not confirm the marvel that was being universally sung. Suddenly, when I was hardly thinking of it, yet was standing there with my eyes fixed on those of the Virgin Mary, I saw clearly an obvious movement in both the holy eyes. I observed that the eyeballs moved while the pupils were gradually raised, then almost totally concealed under the upper eyelids so that the dark pupils no longer could be seen. Then I noticed that after a brief space of time the pupils lowered slowly and returned to their proper position. . . . The movement of the pupils up and down was accomplished with much grace and majesty, so that although it excited devotion, faith and tenderness, it imposed at the same time a real respect and veneration which touched all hearts.

In the same instant in which I myself saw this miraculous movement, the spectators around me confirmed it with cries, tears and loud rejoicing, as they beheld so moving a spectacle, exclaiming: EVVIVA MARIA! *Watch for the miracle! See, she is moving her eyes!!!*

Under the pretext of wishing to adjust a candle burning before the image, I took a ladder and climbed until I was on a level with the face of the Madonna. I fixed the candle, but this was not the object of my climb. I wanted to observe minutely whether in the eyes of the effigy or around it there might be some cut or other mark which would excite suspicion—or perhaps something that would warrant seeking behind the painting an artificial means by which the eyes were moved. I was swiftly disabused of this idea, however, for I clearly saw that the painting, especially that section where the eyes were, was all smooth and without the slightest sign of artificiality or alteration.

On the following Monday a bold thought occurred to me. . . . I provided myself with a compass and made a visit to the shrine. I paused, reciting litanies and other prayers. About a quarter of an hour later the marvel took place before me. I hurriedly climbed the ladder, holding in my hands the compass I had prepared; once again I found myself on a level with the eyes of the effigy and opportunely, for the pupils had not lowered but were still covered with the eyelids. I placed one point of the compass on the lower extremity of that part of the pupil which was not completely covered by the eyelid, and the other point of the compass I placed on the edge of the lower eyelid. By this scheme I hoped to see how much of the white portion could then be seen. . . . When the pupil returned to its place I could no longer perceive any portion of the white since the pupil immediately adjoined the lower eyelid. I descended satisfied that I had done every-

thing possible to verify the miracle and to exclude all the doubt that had been in my mind.

During these extraordinary events an eleven year old girl, Marianna Maronti, who had been a cripple from birth, was carried in the arms of her mother to the shrine. Hardly had she reached the sacred scene when she was instantly cured. Aroused to joy at the sight of this prodigy, the people again broke into cries of EVVIVA MARIA!

After such marvels it was inevitable that devotion to this shrine became ever more popular. This in turn resulted in increased offerings which made possible plans for the greater embellishment of the beloved place.

A royal devotee joined the number of those who have loved this *madonnella* when the English King James III, the "Old Pretender," took residence in the adjacent Palazzo Savorelli, now called Palazzo Balestra. The monarch posted guards before the shrine so that the passageway leading to it might remain open all night.

Midway in the nineteenth century there arose around the humble shrine a sumptuous chapel. This was due to the generosity of the Papazzurri-Savorelli, the same family which had originally sponsored the shrine. The Marchesi Alessandro and Caterina commissioned in 1851 the architect Virginio Vespignani to construct a small sanctuary. He built the chapel which we admire to this day. Vespignani created so beautiful a work of art that he boasted unashamedly of it. He would often bring his pupils to the chapel in order to instruct them in points of architecture. His modestly proportioned little temple has a grandeur that is the admiration of visitors, especially in the harmony of the total result, its gracefulness of detail and the richness of its ornamentation. The outside is extremely simple. The door is framed by doric pillars and above it is the crest of the Papazzurri family. Above this is a tablet with the inscription:

MARIAE DOMINAE NOSTRAE
ALEXANDER MUTIUS DE PAPPACIURRIS MARCH.
ANTEA SAVORELLIUS COM.
CELLULA AMPLIATA THOLO SUPERSTRUCTO
A FUND. REFECIT EXORNAVIT
AN. A. P. V. M.DCCC.LI

No sooner does one pass the threshold than he is overwhelmed by the richness of his surroundings. Gold appears in profusion everywhere: in the cupola, the arches and all the cornices. Yet its presence does not create a sense of heaviness; it serves rather to place in relief the elegance of the exquisitely detailed ornaments which enliven the sober neo-classical lines of the interior. The aisle brings one into a small *crociera* surmounted by a dome divided into highly decorated sections rich in gold. In the midst of all the paintings and sculptures there are reproduced Latin epigrams together with a crest of the Savorelli. On the side walls two niches form arches like small chapels, with four smaller niches containing statues of angels by the sculptor Luigi Simonetti. Other niches near the altar are adorned with statues of angels.

In the vault of the cupola are resplendent ornamentations surrounding a fresco of the Immaculate Conception, circled by verses from the Magnificat. Below are reproduced Wisdom, Prudence, Fortitude and Innocence, painted by the artist Brumidi.

Over the altar a background of malachite, lapis lazuli, and other costly stones sets off the golden carved frame of the miraculous image of the Madonna, the title, *Causa Nostrae Laetitiae,* being inscribed under the frame. The painting is almost square in form and reproduces a half-bust of the Virgin. The countenance is most beautiful, perfectly oval, and is illumined by the sweet expression of the eyes.

The dedication of the new sanctuary took place May 31, 1851. The solemn ceremonies were attended by several Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops and other illustrious personages. Fr. Facchini, S.J., addressed the huge gathering.

From then until the sad day of 1870 Roman nobles and common folk alike came in procession almost every night to recite their prayers in the chapel of the *Madonna dell' Archetto.* After 1870 the architect Francesco Vespignani, son of Virginio, took care of the chapel for a few years, but then it was abandoned for a time. In 1918 a new society was formed, the *Primaria Società Cattolica Promotrice di Buone Opere,* and its members assumed responsibility for the preservation of the shrine and its exquisite chapel. Each night they unite in goodly numbers for regular prayer and annually on the feast of the Nativity of Mary a solemn celebration is held under their auspices.

No more appropriate place could be chosen to end this pilgrimage to the street shrines of Rome than the chapel of the *Madonna dell' Archetto,* a truly Roman sanctuary, fragrant with Roman flowers and redolent of Roman prayers, where every day devout witness is borne to the love for Mary of that city which dares claim Her Son as its First Citizen: Rome *onde Cristo è Romano.*

✠ JOHN WRIGHT
Bishop of Worcester

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for April, 1900, is contributed by Fr. W. Poland, S.J., and is entitled "The Natural Law in Marriage." It is a clear and detailed exposition of the various truths which reason can prove in respect to the contract and state of matrimony. The years which have intervened since this article was written prove the wisdom of the author's concluding statement: "Whenever civil legislators have presumed to trifle with nature's law of marriage, they have created depravity of morals and have loosened the very foundation stones of civil and social life. . . . The public presumption to annul the laws of nature, and the consequent flagrant violation of those laws under the mantle of the civil statutes, which should stand as the custodian of nature's laws in society, will bring its retribution." . . . Continuing his articles on wine for the Mass, Fr. John Mooney distinguishes between the adulteration and what he calls the "sophistication" of wine. By this he means the blending of different wines, and of this process he says: "Blended wines, provided they be sound natural wines and no extraneous matter has been added to them, are licitly used as altar wines." . . . An article by Fr. A. Mulligan, of England, lays down some rules whereby the priest will be enabled to discern danger of death in the case of certain sicknesses, such as pneumonia, typhoid and kidney disease. . . . The Analecta section contains a letter of Pope Leo XIII to one of the bishops of Southern Italy, condemning the abuse of deferring too long the baptism of infants. . . . A correspondent asks if it is permissible for one priest to conduct the first part of the service of Easter Saturday, leaving to another priest the Prophecies and the Mass, and is given the answer that this is not allowed without special dispensation. . . . There is a review of a musical composition by St. Alphonsus—a duet on the Passion, representing a conversation between the suffering Christ and the devout soul. The manuscript of this composition was found in the British Museum in 1860, a century after it was written by the Saint.

F. J. C.

THE MINISTER'S INTENTION IN BAPTISM

Much has been said and written about the essential elements of baptism. The Church does not waver or leave any room for doubt or debate. She holds and applies to baptism what the Council of Florence has so clearly and tersely set forth in its Decree for the Armenians: "Omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum *cum intentione faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia:* quorum si aliquod desit, non perficitur sacramentum."[1]

It is then certain and admitted by all that, besides the matter and form prescribed by Christ, also the proper intention on the part of the minister is required for validity in the administration of baptism. However, as is commonly taught by theologians, this intention need not necessarily be explicit or express, nor determinate and distinct or well-defined; it is quite sufficient that it exist confusedly and implicitly in the mind of the minister. Indeed, no more is necessary than that he intends to perform what the Church performs, or what Christ instituted and ordered to be done, or what he ordinarily sees pastors or Christians do in their churches. This remains true although interiorly in his heart and mind he feels and is convinced that this is a vain and meaningless ceremony and that the Church in performing it certainly errs and posits a purely inefficacious act. This conclusion is evident from the practice of the Church, for she will not order or allow rebaptism for the sole and simple reason that a Jew or Saracen, pagan or heretic, who frequently know little or nothing about the purpose and powers of baptism, administered the sacrament, provided of course the duly requisite matter and form were employed.

In recent years the question touching the minister's intention as required in baptism has become a storm center for debates and controversies in the United States. There is no dearth of material as there is an abundant crop of sects in the field differing widely in their views and practices with reference to baptism. Arguments are brought forth and illustrated, theories are formulated and advanced, and conclusions are arrived at that arrest our attention

[1] *DB*, 695.

and bid us pause for reflection. Some denominations, while still holding baptism to have been divinely instituted by Christ, refuse to believe that in this laver of regeneration sins are washed away. They distinctly and pointedly teach and preach that the sacrament has no regenerative power and consequently is not conferred or intended to be conferred for the remission of sins. They believe and hold in fact that it is but a ceremonial confession of belief in Christ by one who is already saved by faith; or a symbol expressing one's dedication and obedience to God and typifying the Christian character and grace or salvation already acquired from God; or an emblem showing forth the burial and resurrection of Christ and giving testimony of one's faith in the resurrection from the dead; or a badge expressing one's separation from the world and initiation and adherence to the sect. By these and similar modes of expression they clearly manifest that they have abandoned and falsified the true and genuine notion and character of the sacrament, since they deny it to be an efficacious sign of grace and strip it of its efficacy to regenerate.

Nor do the sectarians content themselves with merely maintaining and fostering heretical ideas and tenets privately; they defend and propagate them publicly in their schools and pulpits, and even endeavor to carry their errors over into their rituals. Hence we see them resorting to various manipulations, insertions, deletions and alterations, so adroitly made in the ritual, that the prayers and ceremonies will lend themselves in that sense and convey that meaning which they intend. If then the prayers and formulas be taken and regarded as a whole, it becomes quite apparent that their ritual embodies a sense that differs from and is incompatible with Catholic truth and teaching. Nothing, however, would seem more natural than to suppose that the minister who recites these formulas and performs the rite, approves that sense and makes it his own. The conclusion would then seem warranted that any systematic attempt and artifice made use of deliberately with a design to impress upon the form of the sacrament of baptism a meaning essentially at variance with the Church's sense and extruding from the act of baptizing its true character and virtue to regenerate, would constitute a valid argument and sufficient proof that the minister in performing the baptism no longer has the intention of doing what the Church does and what

Christ instituted and commanded. To buttress this principle and conclusion appeal is also made to the Apostolic Letter *Apostolicae Curae* of Sept. 13, 1896, wherein Leo XIII condemned orders conferred in the Anglican church because of the essentially faulty intention as revealed in the corruptions introduced into the Edwardine Ordinal.[2] As a consequence, once such a tampering with the form has been discovered and made certain in the ritual, formal or equivalent, written or unwritten, we have good reasons and grounds aplenty for the general presumption that the sacrament was invalidly conferred because of the vitiating and essentially defective intention in the minister; and this presumption will only yield to positive contrary proof. Such is the case, it is contended, with the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and the Disciples of Christ (Campbellites or Christian Church).

The presumption here set up has not remained a mere theory relegated to the realms of academic speculation and discussion. It has been pressed into service and pushed to its utmost conclusions in practice. Hence in some dioceses a convert who had previously married, is permitted the use of the Pauline privilege to dissolve his union, even when it can be shown that either or both of the couple had been baptized in one or other of the sects just mentioned; similarly the Petrine privilege may be used in favor of Faith whenever one of the parties has received real baptism and the other has been baptized in one of these sects. Other dioceses have had some scruples about carrying the principle into practice without having first referred the matter to the Holy See. Thus the case has been brought to the attention of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, which in its general session on Dec. 21, 1949, after having submitted the question to a thorough examination and previous discussion, issued the following decree:

Ad Supremam hanc S. Congregationem a nonnullis Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis Ordinariis delatum fuit DUBIUM:

Utrum, in diiudicandis causis matrimonialibus, baptismus in sectis Discipulorum Christi, Presbyterianorum, Congregationalistarum, Baptistarum, Methodistarum collatus, posita necessaria materia et forma, praesumendus sit invalidus ob defectum requisitae in ministro intentionis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia vel quod Christus fieri iussit; an

---

[2] *Fontes*, III, n. 631, pp. 494 ff.

vero praesumendus sit validus, nisi in casu particulari contrarium probetur.

Feria IV, die 21 Decembris 1949.

E.mi ac Rev.mi DD. Cardinales rebus fidei et morum tutandis praepositi, praehabito RR. DD. Consultorum voto, respondendum decreverunt:

Negative ad primam partem;

Affirmative ad secundam partem.

Et insequenti feria V, die 22 eiusdem mensis et anni, SS.mus D.N.D. Pius divina providentia Papa XII in solita audientia Exc.mo ac Rev.mo Adsessori S. Officii impertita, relatam Sibi E.morum Patrum resolutionem adprobavit, confirmavit et publicari iussit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. Officii, die 28 Decembris 1949.

The text of the decree has been cautiously worded. It speaks of baptism as found and administered in these sects, in reference to marriage only: *in diiudicandis causis matrimonialibus.* According to the well known axiom, *Legislator quod voluit expressit, quod noluit, tacuit,* the Sacred Congregation in formulating the decision had no intention of laying down a ruling whereby, in general, doubts concerning baptisms in these sects might be solved. Such a general principle for any and all non-Catholic baptisms had been given and reiterated in earlier decisions and there is no reason to rehearse or modify it in the present instance:

Utrum conferri debeat baptismus sub conditione haereticis qui ad catholicam fidem convertuntur e quocumque loco proveniant et ad quamcumque sectam pertineant. R: Negative; sed in conversione haereticorum, a quocumque loco vel a quacumque secta venerint, inquirendum est de validitate baptismi in haeresi suscepti. Instituto igitur in singulis casibus examine, si compertum fuerit, aut nullum, aut nulliter collatum fuisse, baptizandi erunt absolute. Si autem pro temporum et locorum ratione, investigatione peracta, nihil sive pro validitate, sive pro invaliditate detegatur, aut adhuc probabile dubium de baptismi validitate supersit, tunc sub conditione secreto baptizentur. Demum si constiterit validum fuisse, recipiendi erunt tantummodo ad abiurationem et professionem fidei.[3]

Therefore in receiving converts into the Church from any sect whatsoever, each case is to be investigated, and if the inquiry brings to light that baptism was conferred either invalidly or not at all,

[3] S.C., Nov. 20, 1878, and repeated Feb. 21, 1883 *(Font.* IV, n. 1058, p. 380, resp. n. 1078, p. 411.

the sacrament is to be administered absolutely; if the point of validity or invalidity remains doubtful, the sacrament is to be conferred conditionally; if evidence for validity be manifest, abjuration and profession of faith—with absolution from censures, should the case require this—alone are necessary. Moralists, however, warn us that, given the present day widespread carelessness of ministers and laxity of views on baptism in the sects, baptism will nearly always need to be performed at least conditionally. This course is to be followed in view of the fact that baptism is a sacrament necessary by necessity of means for salvation.

In this decision the Sacred Congregation does not even envisage a future marriage, or a marriage about to be contracted between a Catholic and a Protestant spouse baptized in one of the sects in question, when there are no complications of a previous marriage. Such instances do not constitute *causes* but *cases* that can readily be taken care of in practice. Either the previous investigation will establish the nullity or lack of baptism, and then dispensation from disparity of worship is required; or it will prove the validity of baptism, and then dispensation from mixed religion is demanded; or it will be discovered that the baptism is doubtful as to its fact or its validity, and in this event baptism formerly was regularly presumed and consequently dispensation from mixed religion only was procured and applied on the principle commonly accepted in practice and canonical jurisprudence, viz., *baptismus dubius dubio sive iuris sive facti censendus est validus in ordine ad matrimonii validitatem.* In this last class of cases it has become customary in more recent times to grant a dispensation from mixed religion and *ad cautelam* from disparity of cult as well, and thus the validity of marriage is safeguarded for all future eventualities. This method of dispensing *ad cautelam* has the full appoval and sanction of the Holy See, inasmuch as the Holy Office itself empowers Ordinaries in virtue of the quinquennial faculties to dispense "super impedimento mixtae religionis et, si casus fert, etiam super disparitate cultus, *ad cautelam,* quoties prudens dubium oriatur de collatione baptismi partis acatholicae." [4]

The matrimonial *causes* that the decree has in mind are marriages which had been previously contracted by a member of these sects and which are now being subjected to an examination, whether

[4] *Index facul.* Formula IV, I, n. 2.

judicially or administratively, with the intent of either verifying the absolute indissolubility of bond or of ascertaining and eventually exploiting the possibility of a dissolution. It is needless to point out here what a decisive role baptism would play in processes of this kind not only with reference to the application of the Pauline or Petrine privilege, but also with regard to producing proofs that a marriage remained unconsummated *post baptismum utriusque partis.* If the invalidity of baptism in the five aforementioned sects could be validly maintained and canonically admitted in practice by way of a general presumption on the basis of an essentially vitiated intention in the minister, it would be well-nigh impossible at this juncture to foresee and realize the vast repercussions and consequences in practical life. Certainly its effects upon matrimonial discipline would be revolutionary. But the Cardinals, far from lending their support to this presumption, rejected it and set up the contrary principle: *in causis matrimonialibus baptismus in his sectis praesumitur validus, nisi in casu particulari contrarium probetur.*

The question about essential matter did not arise. The sects specifically enumerated were assumed to use the necessary matter essential for baptism. The Holy Office did not enter into that aspect of baptism. Similarly, in the act of baptizing, the sects have retained the essential form consisting in the scriptural words as in the use in the Catholic rite of baptism. This also the Cardinals took for granted. The essentially necessary form applied to the matter determines the rite to signify and express the sacramental action and both combined constitute the sensible sacramental sign. But besides this *essential* part of the rite of baptism the ritual also contains prayers and actions or ceremonies that precede, accompany or follow the essential rite. These accessory parts in the ritual constitute the *accidental* or *ceremonial* portion of the rite of baptism.

Changes and expression of false notions and heretical tenets in the accidental or ceremonial portions of the rite, leaving however the essential rite intact, do not *per se* affect the validity of the sacrament; they are merely the expression of error which is very well compatible with the minister's right intention of doing what Christ had commanded when he performs the essential rite. But changes and corruptions in the essential rite whereby the form

no longer expresses what must necessarily be expressed or the action assumes and embodies a meaning and conveys a sense other than that willed and intended by Christ essentially vitiate the sacrament and therefore necessarily make it null and void. Says Leo XIII in his Bull on Anglican Orders:

> Omnesque norunt, sacramenta novae legis, utpote signa sensibilia atque gratiae invisibilis efficientia, debere gratiam et significare quam efficiunt et efficere quam significant. Quae significatio, etsi in toto ritu essentiali, materia scilicet et forma, haberi debet, praecipue tamen ad formam pertinet; quum materia sit pars per se non determinata, quae per illam determinetur. . . . Non ea igitur forma esse apta et sufficiens sacramento potest, quae id nempe reticet quod deberet proprium significare.[5]

Anglican ordinations were declared invalid precisely because the *essential form* had been mutilated in such a way that the words used in the new Edwardine Ordinal no longer expressed what had to be necessarily expressed nor bore that signification which Christ had instituted in the sacrament of orders. As a matter of fact the Ordinal, which was the ritual accepted in practice and used constantly for over a century in the Anglican church, imparted priestly ordination and episcopal consecration merely with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," in the case of priesthood, and "Take the Holy Ghost," in that of the episcopate, as essential form adjoined with the imposition of hands. But these words contain nothing definite or distinctive which would specifically determine, define and discriminate the order of priesthood, or its grace and powers, as distinct from the episcopate, and the whole rite, namely the imposition of hands joined with these words as form, might equally lend itself to express and indicate the matter and form of confirmation. There was then an essential defect as to form in the Anglican rite of ordination and that defect was not supplied or sanated in the accompanying ceremonial prayers and circumstances. For these had been so drastically purged that everything relating to the dignity, chief functions and powers of orders had been carefully cut out and all idea of consecration and sacrifice had been deliberately struck out. Later, in 1662, when over a hundred years had elapsed, an attempt was made to remedy this insufficiency by adding to the words of the form used in sacerdotal ordination,

[5] *Apostolicae Curae*, Sept. 13, 1896, n. 8 (*Font.* III, n. 631, pp. 494 ff.).

namely "Receive the Holy Ghost," the clause: "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands"; and to the words, "Take the Holy Ghost," in episcopal consecration, this: "for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands." But by now all apostolic succession had certainly lapsed so that the power to transmit the sacrament of orders had been irreparably broken and could not be resuscitated by making additions to the form. Consequently Anglican orders are definitely invalid owing to the fact that the substantially vitiated form lacked an essential condition for sufficiency.

In the Apostolic Letter *Apostolicae Curae* Leo XIII briefly states and clinches the argument with regards to the priesthood in the following words:

> Cuius [ordinis] conferendi materia, quatenus hoc loco se dat consideandam, est manuum impositio; quae quidem nihil definitum per se significat, et aeque ad quosdam ordines, aeque ad confirmationem usurpatur. Iamvero verba quae ad proximam usque aetatem habentur passim ab Anglicanis tamquam forma propria ordinationis presbyteralis, videlicet, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,* minime sane significant definite ordinem sacerdotii vel eius gratiam et potestatem, quae est potestas *consecrandi et offerendi verum corpus et sanguinem Domini* eo sacrificio, *quod non est nuda commemoratio sacrificii in Cruce peracti.* Forma huiusmodi aucta quidem est postea iis verbis, *ad officium et opus presbyteri:* sed hoc potius convincit, Anglicanos vidisse ipsos primam eam formam fuisse mancam neque idoneam rei. Eadem vero adiectio, si forte quidem legitimam significationem apponere formae posset, serius est inducta, elapso iam saeculo post receptum Ordinale eduardinum; quum propterea, hierarchia extincta, potestas ordinandi iam nulla esset. Nequidquam porro auxilium causae novissime arcessitum est ab aliis eiusdem Ordinalis precibus. Nam, ut cetera praetereantur quae eas demonstrent in ritu anglicano minus sufficientes proposito, unum hoc argumentum sit instar omnium, de ipsis consulto detractum esse quidquid in ritu catholico dignitatem et officia sacerdotii perspicue designat. Non ea igitur forma esse apta et sufficiens sacramento potest, quae id nempe reticet quod deberet proprium significare.[6]

In a like manner the Pontiff goes on to show that the form, "accipe Spiritum Sanctum," was wholly insufficient and ineffective

[6] *Const. cit.,* n. 8, *loc. cit.*

to save the validity of episcopal consecration, and winds up with the following pointed and pertinent words:

Quamobrem toto Ordinali non modo nulla est aperta mentio sacrificii, consecrationis, sacerdotii, potestatisque consecrandi et sacrificii offerendi, sed immo omnino huius modi rerum vestigia, quae superessent in precationibus ritus catholici non plane reiectis, sublata et deleta sunt de industria, quod supra attigimus. Ita per se apparet nativa Ordinalis indoles ac spiritus, uti loquuntur. Hinc vero ab origine ducto vitio, si valere ad usum ordinationum minime potuit, nequaquam decursu aetatum, quum tale ipsum permanserit, futurum fuit ut valeret. Atque ii egerunt frustra qui inde a temporibus Caroli I conati sunt admittere aliquid sacrificii et sacerdoti, non nulla deinde ad Ordinale facta accessione: frustraque similiter contendit pars ea Anglicanorum non ita magna, recentiore tempore coalita, quae arbitratur posse idem Ordinale ad sanam rectamque sententiam intelligi et deduci. Vana, inquimus, fuere et sunt huiusmodi conata: idque hac etiam de causa, quod, si qua quidem verba, in Ordinali anglicano, ut nunc est, porrigant se in ambiguum, ea tamen sumere sensum eumdem nequeunt quem habent in ritu catholico. Nam semel novato ritu, ut vidimus, quo nempe negetur vel adulteretur sacramentum Ordinis, et a quo quaevis notio repudiata sit consecrationis et sacrificii; iam minime constat formula, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,* qui Spiritum, cum gratia nimirum sacramenti, in animam infunditur; minimeque constant verba illa, *ad officium et opus presbyteri* vel *episcopi* ac similia, quae restant nomina sine re quam instituit Christus.[7]

The argument derived from the substantially defective form was the Pope's primary reason for condemning Anglican orders; only secondarily and, as it were, incidentally he resorted to the argument based on a faulty intention. This whole argument is proposed, developed, and confined within a dozen lines, wherein he charges the authors of the Ordinal with having deliberately and intentionally changed and adulterated the accepted ritual in order to establish a novel rite and thereby reject what the Church does and what by institution of Christ belongs to the very essence of the sacrament:

De mente vel intentione, utpote quae per se quiddam est interius, Ecclesia non iudicat; at quatenus extra proditur, iudicare de ea debet. Iamvero *quum quis ad sacramentum conficiendum et conferendum mate-*

---

[7] *Const. cit.*, n. 9, 10, *loc. cit.*

riam formamque debitam serio ac rite adhibuit, eo ipso censetur id nimirum facere intendisse quod facit Ecclesia. Quo sane principio innititur doctrina quae tenet esse vere sacramentum vel illud, quod ministerio hominis haeretici aut non baptizati, dummodo ritu catholico, conferatur. *Contra, si ritus immutetur, eo manifesto consilio ut alius inducatur ab Ecclesia non receptus, utque id repellatur quod facit Ecclesia et quod ex institutione Christi ad naturam attinet sacramenti tunc palam est, non solum necessariam sacramento intentionem deesse, sed intentionem immo haberi sacramento adversam et repugnantem.*[8]

From what has been said in the foregoing it would appear to us that the question of Anglican Ordinations differs *toto coelo* from that of baptism in the sects we are dealing with and therefore it is futile to appeal to the argument of analogy in proof of their invalidity of baptism. Specifically:

(A) Leo XIII deduced nullity of ordination primarily from the *substantially altered essential form.* In our case all the sects have kept the essential form intact as it was instituted by Christ, handed down by the Scriptures and practiced for long centuries in the Church, and that implies that they have a general intention to apply, perform, and repeat that same divinely instituted rite exactly. Whatever opinions they may hold about the nature, necessity, efficacy and effect of baptism, at least they have never dared as much as to touch, repudiate or adulterate the scriptural form in any way. This cannot be said for the Anglicans with reference to orders.

(B) In the Edwardine Ordinal the very form, *Receive the Holy Ghost, Take the Holy Ghost,* was faulty and insufficient; it lacked precisely the determinant part, that part which determines the matter for the sacrament, or "which ought both to signify the grace the sacraments effect and effect the grace they signify." It might be observed that the form actually used could have been sufficient and rightly understood, if from the context the prayers in the *ceremonial part* of the rite of ordination had indicated clearly that here and now there is question of conferring the order of real priesthood, or the power to consecrate and offer the true Body and Blood of Christ, in the rite of priesthood, and to ordain ministers for the sacrifice and the Eucharist in the rite of the episcopate. The form, if uttered here and now in such a context, could have suggested and conveyed the correct sense, complete and determinate, to bystanders who happened to hear or read them. Hence the

[8] *Const. cit.,* n. 10, *loc. cit.*

words of the form taken by themselves apart from the context were, to say the very least, clouded in ambiguity, but taken in their context, as found in the Edwardine Ordinal, they are not only ambiguous but also totally insufficient. For nowhere in the Ordinal is mention made of sacrifice, consecration, priesthood, the power to consecrate and offer sacrifice; and in the prayers that still betray some vestige of Catholic origin, of set purpose everything has been removed that would definitely connote the dignity and function of the priesthood and episcopate. Rightly the Pontiff therefore concludes that the Anglicans had not acted lightly and carelessly in changing the essential form, but with all due purpose and consideration had intended to repudiate the ideas of sacrifice and consecration in the rite, or, what amounts to the same thing, to deny and exclude from it the true priesthood and sacrament of orders, and thus effectively they set up a new purely human rite. Hence Anglicans, in using this novel crippled form, by positive will and intention no longer do what the Church does and what Christ had instituted in the sacrament of orders. In this wise Anglican ordinations are invalid also by reason of a defective intention.

On the contrary in the baptismal rite of the sects under consideration the *essential form* has been preserved scrupulously and only in the *ceremonial* section we meet with prayers and expressions which, originating from their erroneous notions, are at variance with the true sacrament of baptism. Yet even here are found expressions now and then that admit of a right sense. There is then no justification to appeal to Anglican orders in support of the invalidity of baptism in the sects as there is no parity between the cases.

In publishing its decree the Holy Office was by no means launching out into unexplored and uncharted seas. Such questions had been raised before and the Congregation in the present instance merely added one more pronouncement to earlier declarations of a similar character. Already over a century ago the Custodian of the Holy Land had proposed a doubt about the baptisms conferred by heretics and schismatics, and instanced the case of a bishop who formerly, as a schismatic, out of hatred for the Catholic religion never had the intention of truly baptizing, when he administered the sacrament to children of Catholic parents. The Sacred Congregation replied on Jan. 30, 1833, that there was no good reason

for rebaptizing, as the doubt had as a basis but a very slight generic presumption in its favor, and in an instruction, of which this reply is a part, it laid down the general principle: "Ad valorem sacramenti non requiritur expressa, et distincta intentio faciendi Sacramentum, sed sufficit confusa et implicita, qua quis intendat facere id quod facit Ecclesia Christi, aut quod Christus instituit, aut quod vidit per parochum fieri, aut quod christiani faciunt." [9]

To illustrate this doctrinal principle the instruction calls to mind the practice of the Church, which does not sanction rebaptism because of the fact that a pagan or an ignorant person had administered the sacrament, although these had no distinct knowledge of baptism, and then continues, quoting Benedict XIV, *De Synodo, lib.* VII, *cap.* VI: "Caveat Episcopus ne incertam et dubiam pronunciet baptismi validitatem hoc tantum nomine quod haereticus a quo fuit collatus, cum non credat per regenerationis lavacrum deleri peccata, illud non contulerit in remissionem peccatorum, atque ideo non habuerit intentionem illud conficiendi, prout a Christo Domino est institutum." In confirmation of this statement it culls from history the fact that at one time in Gaul a dispute had arisen whether those baptized by the Calvinists should be rebaptized, but that St. Pius V settled the controversy by defining that baptism was not to be repeated. It assigns the reason for this decision in the words taken from the text of Benedict XIV: "Sacramenti enim *validitatem non afficit privatus ministri error, cui praevalet generalis eiusdem ministri intentio faciendi quod Christus instituit,* seu quod fit in vera Ecclesia Christi." Finally to drive home, as it were, the point under discussion, it adduces a very pertinent passage from the acts of the Council of Evreux (1576):

> Ante decisionem Apostolicae Sedis Romanae, licuit fortasse cuique in suo sensu abundare. Verum, quoniam post habitam de hac facultate disputationem, felicis recordationis Pius V definivit verum esse baptisma, quo uterentur calvinistae adhibentes formam et materiam institutam a Christo cum intentione generali faciendi quod Christus instituit, *licet errarent in particulari interpretatione et singulari intentione, ut alii fere omnes haeretici erraverunt* vel *circa intelligentiam formae* baptismatis, vel *circa aliquem effectum.* Ob id baptizatos ab ipsis calvinistis non iterum tingendos sub conditione.

It should be noted that the Calvinists, like our sects, denied

[9] *Font.* IV, n. 871, pp. 153 ff.

baptism to have any efficacy to regenerate. Yet the instruction makes it clear that erroneous views in the minister "circa intelligentiam formae vel aliquem effectum" do not render the sacrament invalid, provided the right matter and form instituted by Christ were used with the general intention to perform what Christ had instituted; that this general intention prevails over the particular error or wrong private interpretation. Error and heretical opinion about the nature and effects of baptism can therefore coexist with a sincere intention of doing what Christ did or had instituted.

On Dec. 18, 1872, the same Sacred Congregation addressed a long instruction to the Vicar Apostolic of Central Oceania. After having discussed and solved various queries about matrimony, the Congregation takes up the doubts touching baptism towards the end of the instruction. This missionary prelate had reported: "In quibusdam locis nonnulli [haeretici] baptizant cum materia et forma debitis, simultanee applicatis, sed expresse monent baptizandos, ne credant baptismum habere ullum effectum in animam: dicunt enim ipsum esse signum mere externum aggregationis illorum sectae. Itaque illi saepe catholicos in derisum vertunt circa eorum fidem de effectibus baptismi, quam vocant quidem superstitiosam," and thereupon formulated a twofold question: "1. Utrum baptismus ab illis haereticis administratus sit dubius propter defectum intentionis faciendi quod voluit Christus, *si express declaratum fuerit a ministro, antequam baptizet, baptismum nullum habere effectum in animam.* 2. Utrum dubius sit baptismus sic collatus, si praedicta declaratio non expresse facta fuerit immediate, antequam baptismus conferetur, sed illa saepe pronuntiata fuerit a ministro, et illa doctrina aperte praedicetur in illa secta." [10]

The facts presented in this case bear a striking resemblance to the attitude on baptism prevailing in our sects. The Congregation does not reply off-hand, but prepares its answer by making various observations. It again repeats the quotation from Benedict XIV and cites the decision of St. Pius V regarding the Calvinists already adduced in the foregoing instruction of 1833. It further sets forth the mind of the Church by quoting from Bellarmine: "Neque dicit [Concilium Trident.] oportere ministrum intendere quod Ecclesia intendit, sed quod Ecclesia facit. Porro, quod Ecclesia facit, non finem, sed actionem significat. Denique ex praxi id

[10] *Font.* IV, n. 1024, pp. 327 ff., 335.

constat; nam neque vetus Ecclesia rebaptizabat baptizatos parvulos a pelagianis, nec nos rebaptizamus baptizatos a zwinglianis, et calvinistis; et tamen scimus, *omnes istos baptizare sine intentione veri finis, qui est tollere peccatum originale.*" It cites the words pronounced by Innocent IV about a Saracen baptism: "validum esse baptisma collatum a saraceno, de quo notum est, non credere per immersionem aliquid fieri, nisi madefactionem, dummodo intenderit facere, quod ceteri baptizantes faciunt." With these motivated premises the Holy Office had given due consideration to the matter and therefore now states its conclusion in responding to the twofold doubt directly and briefly: "Ad primum, Negative: quia, non obstante errore quoad effectus baptismi, non excluditur intentio faciendi quod facit Ecclesia. Ad Secundum, Provisum in primo."

The gist of the decision amounts to this: Error and mistaken notions about baptism, holding it to be but an external sign of aggregation without any effect upon the soul, even when systematically taught as a tenet of a sect and obstinately declared by a minister immediately before the act of baptizing (whether as part of the ceremonial of baptism or not), do not yet destroy the intention of doing what the Church does or what Christ instituted; his general intention prevails over and, as it were, absorbs the private or qualified mental attitude of the minister towards baptism due to false doctrines and heretical ideas; error can coexist with a right intention.

The same doctrine is once more rehearsed and inculcated in an instruction dated Jan. 24, 1877. The Bishop of Nesqually (now Seattle Diocese) had expressed some doubts about the validity of Methodist baptism, because of the sect's heretical views on baptism and the abuses it admitted in the formula of baptism and mode of administration:

Refers, tot et tales esse horum haereticorum *errores circa necessitatem, virtutem et efficaciam eiusmodi sacramenti*, ut pro certo retineri debeat eos illum habere *tanquam ritum mere indifferentem*, quem ideo in praeteritis temporibus penitus omittere consueverunt, et in posterioribus reassumpserunt sola prava voluntate homines infideles, vel etiam fideles fallendi, iisdem scilicet ostendendi falsam eorum religionem a nostra unice vera non differe. His addis, non paucos neque omnino accidentales abusus ab iisdem committi in praedicti sacramenti administratione, inter quos praesertim indicat et usum cuiusdam formae . . . . necnon negli-

gentiam ab iisdem servari solitam in modo quo aqua tingunt baptizandos, et quo coniungere solent materiam cum forma.[11]

The Sacred Congregation informs the Bishop in its response that errors in the minister or in the sect are no obstacle to the validity of baptism, nor do they beget a general presumption of invalidity:

Etenim novit Amplitudo Tua dogma fidei esse baptismum a quocumque sive schismatico, sive haeretico, sive etiam infideli administratum validum esse habendum, dummodo in eiusdem administratione singula concurrerint, quibus sacramentum perficitur, scilicet debita materia, praescripta forma et persona ministri cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia. Hinc consequitur *errores peculiares, quos ministrantes sive privatim, sive etiam publice profitentur nihil officere posse validitati baptismi, vel cuiuscumque sacramenti.*

To illustrate and confirm this declaration of principle the passage from Benedict XIV and the resolution of St. Pius V on Calvinist baptism, as set forth in the instruction of 1833, as well as the teaching of Bellarmine and the decision given in the last instruction of 1872 are produced verbatim. Again the Bishop is told what the tradition of the Church is on the point, viz., that error, be it publicly or privately professed by heretics, does not preclude a right intention in the minister and does not offer a sufficient basis for construing a general presumption against validity:

Videt igitur Amplitudo Tua quomodo in Ecclesia *semper traditum inveniatur, errores quos haeretici sive privatim, sive etiam publice profitentur, non esse incompossibiles cum illa intentione, quam sacramentorum ministri de necessitate eorumdem sacramentorum tenentur habere, faciendi nempe quod facit Ecclesia, vel faciendi quod Christus voluit ut fieret; et eosdem errores per se non posse inducere generalem praesumptionem contra validitatem sacramentorum in genere, et baptismi in specie* ita ut ea ipsa sola statui possit practicum principium omnibus casibus applicandum, vi cuius quasi a priori, ut aiunt, baptismus sit iterum conferendus.

Taking up next the question of abuses, the Sacred Congregation warns that, if a general presumption is to be set up as a practical working principle, it must be derived, not from the defects and

[11] *Font.* IV, n. 1050, pp. 366 ff.

abuses of the ministers of a sect, but from the character, nature and actual usage of the sect. This with reference to the sect in question (Methodists) implies a necessity of inquiring about two things:

videlicet: 1. Utrum ritus administrandi sacramentum baptismi, ab ista secta in istis regionibus retentus, aliquid contineat quod illius nullitatem inducere valeat; 2. Utrum talis sectae ministri de facto sese conforment prasescriptionibus in propria eorum secta sancitis. Porro quoad primam quaestionem facile erit cognoscere quid haec secta circa administrationem sacramenti baptismi sanciverit, ex inspectione librorum ritualium quibus in istis regionibus tales haeretici utuntur; quoad secundum vero necessariae erunt accuratae et prudentes investigationes in singulis casibus, per quas tam de facto, seu de collato baptismo, quam de modo administrationis cognitio obtineatur, iuxta quam iudicium de singulis casibus erit pronunciandum.

If this examination and investigation do not clear up the doubt or suspicion about the validity, baptism is to be repeated conditionally.

From the context and earlier decisions it is apparent that in ordering an inspection of the rituals the Sacred Congregation understood an investigation which was to verify whether the necessary matter and form were used. For questions of error and intention it had just dealt with and settled in the traditional sense that heretical views and tenets, either publicly or privately professed, even when expressed immediately before the act of baptism (whether as part of the ceremonial ritual or not), did not exclude a right intention nor vitiate the sacrament. The reason is that the minister's general intention to do what Christ instituted predominates and absorbs false ideas and opinions.

Error is rooted in the intellect, while intention is an act of the will. The Sacred Congregation does not tire to repeat and insist in its pronouncements that error about the effect of a sacrament does not make it impossible for a minister to have the necessary intention to perform what Christ has instituted. In our estimation canon 1084 clearly enunciates the same principle and applies it to matrimony: "Simplex error circa matrimonii unitatem vel indissolubilitatem aut sacramentalem dignitatem, etsi det causam contractui, non vitiat consensum." In order that such error may vitiate the consent, it must be transferred to and be made part of the intention by a positive act of the will, as is stated explicitly in

canon 1086, § 2: "At si alterutra vel utraque pars *positivo voluntatis actu* excludat matrimonium ipsum, aut omne ius ad coniugalem actum, vel essentialem aliquam matrimonii proprietatem, invalide contrahit."

Analogously in baptism false notions and errors with regard to the nature, efficacy, and effects of the sacrament are compatible with a minister's true and sincere intention of doing what the true Church does or what Christ had instituted. This is a principle that stands out in bold relief as a conclusion from the decisions and pronouncements discussed in the foregoing pages. It is possible, of course, that a minister carry his heretical ideas from the realm of his intellect into that of his intention in such a way that, although pronouncing the words of the essential form in baptism, he wills and intends to administer a mere external rite or ceremony shorn of all spiritual meaning and efficacy. But to bring that about he must elicit a positive act whereby he specifically and definitely excludes and rules out all regeneration when performing the essential rite of baptism. False views and beliefs based upon heretical opinions and teaching, changes and alterations, even when systematically introduced or manifested in the ceremonial parts of the ritual, written or unwritten, do not constitute a sufficient indication and proof that the minister, even when pronouncing the essential form accurately and completely, has a heretical intention so tainted by error as to vitiate the sacrament essentially. For so long as that heretical error as regards baptism manifests itself in the ceremonial portion of the ritual only; so long as the sect holds that material rite of baptism to be an institution of Christ; so long as in the administration of the sacrament the scriptural form, handed down by Christ and observed constantly in the Church, is seriously and scrupulously adhered to; in short, so long as the sect and its ministers think that they are performing and repeating that rite of Christ, the Church justly and reasonably presumes and must presume that they want to do what Christ wanted and instituted and the true Church does, whatever the minister in a particular case may think about the true nature, necessity and efficacy of the sacrament. That general intention predominates over the errors that exist in the mind of the minister and is plainly sufficient to secure the validity of the sacrament, unless it be conclusively shown in a particular case that the minister by a special act of

his will elicited a contrary intention which nullified and destroyed this general intention. This is what the Sacred Congregation had in mind when it declared that in deciding matrimonial causes, baptism, when administered with the duly prescribed matter and form in the sects in question, is not to be considered invalid on account of an essentially defective intention in the minister, sed *baptismus praesumendus est validus, nisi in casu particulari contrarium probetur.*

ULRIC BESTE, O.S.B.

Congregation of the Holy Office
Vatican City.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST AND THE VIRTUE OF FAITH

In the most admirable Sacrament, which is the chief means whereby men are engrafted on the divine nature, men also find the most efficacious help towards progress in every kind of virtue. And first of all in faith. In all ages faith has been attacked; for although it elevates the human mind by bestowing on it the knowledge of the highest truths, yet because, while it makes known the existence of divine mysteries, it yet leaves in obscurity the mode of their being, it is therefore thought to degrade the intellect. But whereas in past times particular articles of faith have been made by turns the object of attack, the seat of war has since been enlarged and extended, until it has come to this, that men deny altogether that there is anything above and beyond nature. Now nothing can be better adapted to promote a renewal of the strength and fervor of faith in the human mind than the mystery of the Eucharist, the "mystery of faith," as it has been most appropriately called. For in this one mystery the entire supernatural order, with all its wealth and variety of wonders, is in a manner summed up and contained.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical letter *Mirae caritatis,* issued May 28, 1902.

DEFAMATION: "THE SIN IN LOVING VIRTUE"

To speak of another's sin, even though we speak truly, can easily be a far greater offense than to commit the other's sin oneself. Serious as another's reported sin might be, it may be more heinous and disgraceful for us to yield to "that temptation that doth goad us on to sin in loving virtue."[1]

Would that this outrageously pharisaical mortal sin of defamation by telling the truth were not so common amongst those who count themselves to be of the Lord's gentry! Would, at least, that they were aware of the commonly mortal injury inflicted thereby on their own souls! Would that, before they give their account to God, they realized the appalling load of obligatory restitution burdening their conscience!

Let's look at this question from the ethical viewpoint of its opposition to the perfection of human nature. The supernatural viewpoint divinely intensifies our natural observations. Calumny, or slander is a lie by which we injure the good name of another. To the grave injury of defamation it adds a depraved lie. But it is hard to say whether it or detraction, the unwarranted telling of the truth which damages another's name, does the greater harm. Slander is worse inasmuch as it is also a lie; but detraction can easily be worse in its injury, which is greater because there is no possibility of disproving the fact told and of repairing the injury somewhat, as there is in slander.

The leader of the gang of defamation's vices is the sin against love of our neighbor, which is very easily and very often grievous, because it hurts him in the worst possible way, in his reputation, on which practically all the phases of his life depend. It causes him poignant pain.

> The stroke of a whip maketh a blue mark;
> But the stroke of the tongue will break the bones.
> Many have fallen by the edge of the sword;
> But not so many as have perished by the tongue . . .
> The death thereof is an evil death;
> And hell is preferable to it.[2]

[1] *Measure for Measure*, II, 2. [2] *Ecclus.*, 28:21 ff.

"Good name, the immediate Jewel of the Soul"

God made man social; and for social existence and perfection, a good name is essential. Hence ethics rightly concludes that God, by giving man such a nature, intended him to have the right to a good name, even though he does actions which if known would destroy that good name; secondly, God intended others to have the correlative obligation not to injure his reputation, even by telling the truth, unless a greater good demand it, such as the protection of society or the improvement of the individual.

Reputation is surpassingly valuable in man's social life, business life, family life, and spiritual life. An injury to it can be a manifold injury, or even a complete paralysis of all functions that are human. Loss of goods cannot be compared with loss of reputation. If our purse or goods are stolen, we can get others; but the theft of our reputation robs us of both our greatest treasure and of our ability to get another. "There are robberies . . . which keep man forever beggared of peace and joy." [3]

Our fellows' esteem of us, and their resulting confidence in us, give us reassuring confidence in ourselves and an energetic enthusiasm in our work.

> Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise
> To scorn delights and live laborious days.[4]

We are happy in that love which is indicated in the esteem of our associates: "A good name is better than precious ointment" [5] in making us agreeable to others. A good reputation certainly opens hearts and souls to our influence as nothing else does. When a good reputation goes ahead of us, it prepares the field to an optimum fertility for our activity's fruitfulness, and it widens the field to its utmost. If a precursor has blackened our name, on our arrival we find all doors shut to us as to the pest. The wreckage of human endeavor and human influence is especially calamitous when the reputation destroyed or injured is of a person having authority over others, such as a parent, a teacher, a superior, an official, a priest or other leader. "Touch not my anointed!" is the stern warning of Jehovah concerning those who are of importance to the people and to His glory.

[3] George Eliot, *Felix Holt*, Introduction.
[4] Milton, *Lycidas*, 70.
[5] *Ecclus.* 7:1.

"Who hath not owned the magic of a name?" [6] Destroy that name and you destroy the magic that makes wonderful things possible. Destroy esteem; and you dig a deep wide moat between the person and all those who thereby lose their esteem of him. We very rightly take care of our good name; for it is more important than money in the business of living. "Have a care of thy good name; for it is worth more, and it will be more lasting, than a thousand and great treasures." [7]

> Good name in man and woman, dear my lord,
> Is the immediate jewel of their souls:
> Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
> 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands.
> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which not enriches him
> And makes me poor indeed.[8]

How sensitive we are to the rumpling of the fine cloth of our good name! How furious we are inclined to become if one makes a tear in it! God gave man this instinctive, inevitable desire of esteem so that he would make himself worthy of esteem by perfecting himself in the eyes of God and of his fellows. Rob a man of his desire of esteem, cut off his opportunity to win esteem, and you have done to him what you would do to an electric motor, if you short-circuited its current; you have robbed him of his power to live a human life.

Wealth is mostly a means to stand out individually from the common herd. What else is the universal sensitiveness to the judgment of others on us, if not the desire of esteem from intellectual beings? We may desire and seek it for unjustified reasons; but we all desire and seek it. Rich and modish clothes occupy an enormous portion of the human race's thought, time, labor and money. Why? Because the wearers value the esteem won by them, little merited as it is, more than they value their labor and time and money. Splendid residences, costly motor cars, social position and intrigue, with all the harassing anxiety and inconvenience involved, are almost entirely directed towards capturing human esteem.

[6] Campbell, *The Pleasures of Hope.*

[7] *Ecclus.* 41:15.

[8] *Othello*, III, 3.

"Where none admire, 'tis useless to excel," says Lyttleton. Take away the esteem of men; and there would be mighty little striving after publicity in the newspapers by excellence in politics, sport, art, business, literature, and science. All these feverish pursuits would lose the great majority of their devotees; an incalculable change would come over the world and over each individual. As the exiled Ovid puts it: "Glory has a tremendous driving power." For many, the esteem received from others is all, or nearly all that is of value, all that is sought. When that is gone, for them all is gone.

> I have lost my reputation! I have lost the immortal
> Part of myself; and what remains is bestial.[9]

Triflingly to destroy so precious a treasure as reputation, is a villainous crime. It is beyond all infamy, lightly and out of mere desire to make conversation, to assert the unfounded gossip that comes into our tickled ears and the unfounded ideas that come into our irresponsible minds, against the name of another.

It is while a person is idling that the tongue works hardest in its reckless demolition of valuable reputations. "At every word, a reputation dies." [10] The social gathering, the field of wit, the arena of sparkling speech, is often gorily strewn of an afternoon or evening with scores of stark corpses of once fair names. "They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; the venom of asps is under their lips." [11] The four o'clock teacup is often more deadly than any bedeviled witch's cauldron of toads, vipers, spiders, and worms. It incites the wagging tongues of would-be honorable men and women to temerarious commission of crimes, worse than if they burnt down their neighbor's house over his head at night.

When we have painstakingly put away furs or fine woolens in the spring, and go to take them out for the coming of winter, how keenly disappointed we are in expectation of their use when we find that moths have ravaged them! But incalculably greater is our neighbor's frustrated chagrin when he wishes to use a carefully preserved reputation and finds that we have gnawed gaping holes in it.

[9] *Othello*, II, 3.
[10] Pope, *The Rape of the Lock*.
[11] *Psalm* 139:4.

Scandals are decomposing corpses; they should be buried as infectious. Perhaps second in power of defamation's gang of vices is its purposed infection of others. The defamer is a sneaking ghoul who in darkness exhumes the buried evil in others' lives to spread its infection. Besides the general effect of scandal in making those ready to do wrong who hear that others do wrong, desire is excited to hear what it is a sin to wish to hear, contrary to the Wise Man's inspired instruction: "Hedge thine ears with thorns when thou hearest a detractor." [12]

Those most eager to know secrets are the ones most eager to destroy their secrecy by incontinently publicizing them. Spendthrifts long for money, not to keep it, but to squander it. Detractors long for secrets, not to keep them, but to broadcast them. We inoculate others with our mortal disease of detraction, making them progressively multiplied carriers of infection. Of all this we are well aware; and all the mortal sins of others are our mortal sins. As we stand before God, surely we have enough in our own sins to occupy our attention and righteous indignation, especially as God is the one who taught us to pray for forgiveness to the extent that we forgive others. Surely, too, our own personal sins are a sufficiently crushing burden, without taking upon us the burdens of dozens and even of hundreds of detractors who sprout from our spore!

Very few persons are ready to counterfeit money; but many will feloniously pass on what they suspect or know to be counterfeit. Many, who are not ready to manufacture lying defamation, do not scruple to circulate what they know is probably a lie or surely will become one.

> And all who told it added something new
> And all who heard it made enlargements, too.
> In every ear it spread, on every tongue it grew.[13]

The third deadly member of defamation's crew is its destruction of peace in the community. "The whisperer hath troubled many that were at peace."[14] Our maligning of others gives rise to intense bitterness and dissension, revenge of any and all sorts, loss of happiness here and often hereafter. "He that narrateth a trans-

[12] *Ecclus.* 28:28.

[13] Pope, *The Temple of Fame.*

[14] *Ecclus.* 28:15.

gression breaketh up friendship."[15] St. Basil directed that not only the religious who spoke of others' faults should be isolated from the community in confinement, but also the one who listened to the detractor; for if the one had not willingly listened, the other would not have willingly recounted his scandalous story.

Amongst defamation's vices there is always one that destroys or seriously injures the rash defamer himself, who is loaded with the many sins entailed in each defamation, all of which can easily be grievous. We would be fiercely indignant were one to call us a thief. Defamation makes us the vilest of thieves; for the gossiping detractor steals a person's most valuable possession, his good name, usually in the dark, without gaining thereby, and merely to steal.

> And there's a lust in them no charm can tame
> Of loudly publishing their neighbor's shame.

This is the tongue-lacing which Juvenal in his ninth *Satire* gives to those wretched characters who are enthusiastically eager to bare others' secret defects. Some suffer the veritable throes of childbirth when they have conceived some defamation through their prurient ears and are in pressing labor until they bring to light through their parturient mouths the monstrous child of their evil hearts. It can hardly be a source of justified pride to them. "Being idlers, they learn to go about from house to house; and are not idlers only, but tattlers, too, and busybodies speaking things which they ought not."[16] Instead of being fully engrossed in our own business, we dribble away our diamond-precious time, and that of others, in vacuous chatting which cannot sustain itself on the news of the day; and so we assault the good name of others.

> Hast thou heard a word against thy neighbor?
> Let it die there; bury it there.
> Let it end there and go not out;
> It will not burst thee.[17]

Birds are entangled in death by their feet; human beings by their tongues. Defamation is not only murderous to others' reputation; it is suicidal to our own. Not only are detractors "abhorred

[15] *Prov.* 17:9. [16] *I Tim.* 5:13. [17] *Ecclus.* 19:10.

of God," [18] they are also "the abomination of men." [19] From our own experience, we can know what others, listening to our disgusting defamation, say to themselves: "I suppose that this defamer speaks about me in the same way when I am absent." A really noble person is likely to think in his heart: "Well, that is the end of my friendship with this detractor." Whatever the guilt of the defamed may be, incriminating others, we certainly convict ourselves of crime, often worse than that which we denounce.

Stupidity is no name for our absurd thinking that we make ourselves agreeable to others by our talebearing, backbiting and "cutting of men's throats by whispering." [20] They may be eagerly interested in what we say, they may admire the manner of our narration, but in their hidden judgment they despise and abominate us. Everyone except the naïve defamer sees the abnormality of mind which thinks to appear better by making others appear worse.

"Among the perfect" and the seekers of perfection

We who aim at perfection of living should be very careful as to our remarks about others; with the most discrete delicacy must we handle the fragile porcelain of another's name; for there we can easily fail, not merely by imperfections, but in serious crime, which may otherwise be quite remote from us. We can well make our comments on others a frequent matter of our daily examination of conscience. Did I speak ill of anyone? How seriously? What shall I do or say when the same circumstances arise, tempting me to repeat the offense? Are there special persons of whom I am inclined to speak ill? To counteract this inclination, I must, when I speak of them, invariably praise them.

Many spiritual persons would not for a moment compromise on venial sin, so as just to coast along mortal sin. Defamation is question of just that. Do we take the attitude: "Oh, it is a small matter in which I malign another?" In other words, can we say: "Oh, it is only a venial sin"? For all defamation is at least a venial sin, inasmuch as it is always an injury to another—and God grant that we are right in the evaluation of its injury! Certainly,

[18] *Rom.* 1:30.
[19] *Prov.* 25:9.
[20] Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, I, 2.

when we are the victim of such an aspersion, we do not dismiss it lightly. Meticulous carefulness in the way in which we speak of others' defects is one of the practical tests by which we show whether we understand perfection of living and are earnest in our efforts to attain it.

This concern is characteristic of St. Ignatius of Loyola. He kept extreme silence about the defects of those in the house with him and of those outside, speaking of them only to those who were able to remedy them. If it was sufficient that only one knew the fault in order to correct it, he took care not to tell two. Superiors under him had to take his severe reprehension for weakening the confidence of their subjects by making known their faults needlessly. A superior should be a parent who sedulously hides the faults of the children from outsiders.

While it is usually more than doubtful that blunt denouncement of the detractor is advisable, the hearer, especially one in authority, should question his conscience: "Could I have efficiently and adroitly stopped the defamation? Was I in any way the cause or encouragement of the sin—for instance, by showing interest or asking questions?"

It is said of St. Augustine that he reminded his guests that he did not want any defamation at his table, by a Latin couplet painted on the dining-room wall, to the effect:

> Who gnaws good names with biting jest
> Is at this board unwelcome guest.

Restitution of Stolen Name

If we rob a person of his capital on which he lives, if we purposely burn down his business location with all his stock, obviously we are bound before God to labor all our lives to reimburse him. Much more so are we bound in justice and charity to labor tirelessly and endlessly to restore his reputation, which we have unconscionably destroyed, and on which he lives much more truly than he lives on his capital and on his business stock. If our injury to one's reputation be grave, as it easily can be, our obligation of restitution is grave, given the paramount value which all rightly place on reputation.

The gravity of defamation's injury, of the sin, and of the obligation to repair the injury, depends on: (1) the nature of the evil

said of another, and its injury done; (2) the person defamed, whether by the truth or by a lie: a parent? a spouse? a merchant? physician? judge? superior? teacher? priest? (3) the number of persons by whom the evil will be believed and repeated.

We must, therefore, restore the defamed person's reputation in the minds of all those to whom we spoke evil of him, and also in all the minds to whom our hearers have repeated the defamation. More easily will you collect all the flying seeds of a dandelion, and all the seeds that have sprouted from those seeds! An especially virulent gossip of Rome, who believed herself to be quite spiritual, was plucking a chicken before her housedoor, in a pan under a cloth, because of a brisk wind that was blowing. Philip Neri, the saintly prankster, was passing that way and stopped to salute her. Just as a gust of wind struck them, he jerked the cloth from over the pan; and hundreds of feathers went flying through the city. Before the housewife could protest, he told her: "You'll have to gather those feathers." Rather piqued, she retorted: "A fine job that would be." Making his point, he drove home his lesson: "It's easier to gather those feathers than to undo the effects of your flying gossip."

If we are unable to restore the good name of injured persons, we are bound in conscience and often grievously to restore to them an equivalent good. "Impossible!" one will say; nevertheless the obligation to try still remains. What is the value of a good name? To restore that value is the multiplied obligation of the defamer.

Criticism

An immorality, working unrealized devastation in the individual and in society, is a minor form of detraction: criticism. There is, of course, good, or constructive, criticism; but nearly all of it is bad and destructive. Constructive criticism has as its litmus-test the desire to do good, love of others. Destructive criticism seeks to hurt others, to diminish or to destroy the good name of another—generally as an hysterical attempt to bolster up one's own esteem, or as an hysterical escape from self-condemnation.

Hysteria is an attempt, partially unrealized, to satisfy two opposed instincts by one emotional and abnormal procedure, which only heightens the person's conflict with reality. The destructive critic often wants to satisfy his instinct for notice from others and

at the same time to satisfy his instinct for avoidance of effort in acquiring nobility or ability, which are the normal ways to get notice. So he uses the emotional and irrational negative course of destroying esteem and notice that others have. The result is that his soul is involved in still greater conflict. His abnormal psychology runs in this vein: by finding fault with others' deeds or personality, I show that I have keenness of perception of what is faulty; I give my sense of inferiority a compensation by superiority presumed in my criticism.

The critic is usually poor wine gone sour; while it does not please us as wine, as vinegar it forces us to take notice of it by its acerbity. We are painfully aware of a sharp-tongued critic in a community; his hysteria is fairly obvious to everyone except himself; and fortunate is the community if the vinegary critic does not sour a great deal of its sweetness, as well as curdle a great deal of the milk of its influence as a group. "*Derisor perdet civitatem*": the cynic will destroy a city. The carping critic chops down the tree with all its blossoms and promise of fruit because he spies a caterpillar or defective twig on it.

The Vices came to give an account to the Devil of the wôrk they had accomplished. Pride, Lust, Avarice, in turn told of thousands of souls which they had made captive for hell. Satan was by no means satisfied with them; and he hurled them from his presence, bellowing after them that they get to work. Then, a little devil, Criticism, recounted to his infernal master that he had hindered untold good from being accomplished; that he had undone a still greater amount of good and had made it useless by carping at it through his slaves, who by working for him destroyed their own name; that he had made Truth itself afraid to acknowledge the good in others; that he had made Justice unfair in blaming the good; that he had destroyed faith in God and in religion by clever raillery in the professor's chair, in society, and in papers and magazines; that he had killed enthusiasm in the hearts of many youths; that he had made Duty ashamed to do what it would not have omitted in the face of any other opposition. "*Come, sit beside me, Brother,*" Satan said.

A variation of criticism, complaints against others, when habitual, are hysterical escapes from self-condemnation. The acrimony of the run-of-the-mill Communist is an escape from subconscious

sense of responsibility for his insuccess. Hence, as regards the mass of Communists, when they become successful financially, they drop their Communism. The earmark of a Communist is bitter faultfinding with his employer and with society in general. The Communist is, essentially and by principle, a complainer. His criticism is wholly destructive and highly emotional in its bitterness. His sickle hacks down whatever flowers there are in the garden of society; and his hammer breaks up its walls and instruments. Wreckage is the calculated objective of destructively critical Communist philosophy.

"Comment on every nice offense"

Faults of others, when unnoticed or unmentioned if noticed, do little harm to others; but brought into high relief by the critic, they first of all make us intimately aware of their existence and thus familiar with them; they lower our esteem for the delinquents; and finally, criticism does not usually make the criticised better, but more brazen in wrong, while generating unvenomed hate of the critic. "It is not meet that every nice offence should bear his comment." [21]

The greatest preacher of all time, St. John the Golden-tongued, pungently portrays the irrationality of criticism and defamation:

> For what, after all, is the good of watching and fasting, when the tongue is drunken and feasts itself at a table [of defamation] more unclean than a table of dog's flesh; when the tongue is grown ravening after blood and pours out filth, and makes itself the mouth of the channel of a sewer. . . .
>
> For no advantage comes from obloquy; none to thee who speakest; none to him who hears thee; none to the person accused. The criticised, on his part, becomes more reckless, since as long as he is unobserved, he is sensible of shame; but as soon as he becomes manifest and notorious, he casts off the curb which the feeling of shame imposed on him.
>
> And the hearer will, in turn, be yet more injured. For if he is conscious to himself of good deeds, he becomes swollenly righteous when another is criticized; or if the hearer is conscious of wrong-doing, he then becomes more eager for iniquity. Thirdly, the speaker himself will both incur the ill-feeling of him that hears him and will provoke

[21] *Julius Caesar*, IV, 3.

God to greater anger against himself. . . . Since, then, thou profitest neither thy hearer nor thyself, nor him that is accused, but dost point thy sword at thine own self,—even from such consideration, do thou learn more soberness.[22]

Critics are beetles, for whom the height of satisfaction is to find corruption somewhere amidst the beauties of nature. They have no eye for the fair flowers of the garden in which they are, nor for the glories of the multi-colored sky. They search out and dig into dung heaps. The perfumes of the flowers do not attract them; their sense of smell is wholly satisfied by dung and decay. Satire is the literature of diseased societies; the satirist's best accomplishment is to foul his own nest with Voltairean scoffing.

Would you know your faults of character? Observe what draws your sharpest criticism in others. We admit this truth only with incredulous reluctance; but who criticises pride, for instance, more than a proud person? We seem to understand, best of all, the vices in which we ourselves fail. Understanding them perfectly, we denounce them more intensely. "A man never shows his character more clearly," says J. P. Richter, "than in portraying that of another." There are two ways of increasing the fractional value of our lives: one by increasing the numerator of our own value; the other, by diminishing the denominator of our criticism of others' value.

FRANCIS J. MCGARRIGLE, S.J.

Seattle College
Seattle, Wash.

[22] *On I Cor.*, Hom. 44, 6.

MISSION INTENTION

"Missions in Uganda, Kenya, and Tanganyika" are the objects of the Holy Father's Mission Intention for the month of April, 1950.

THE OPENING OF THE HOLY DOOR [1]

Underneath the great dome of the Basilica throngs of people gathered around an old picture of the Madonna to hear the forceful and brilliant Fr. Lombardi confidently preach the word of truth. We also listened, and derived benefit from what we heard.

It was Rome's immediate preparation for the great event. The Blessed Virgin, *porta et janua coeli,* was making this work of preparation her own. It was a preparation for the Romans, and for us, who would receive throngs of pilgrims from every land here in the greatest church in Christendom.

Then, that Christmas eve, the sky brightened and the first sweet strains of the Christmas hymns filled the air. At the end of the portico of Constantine, the Holy Father appeared as if in a vision, amid the glitter of the halberds, the glow of the prelatial purple, and the black shakos of the gendarmes. There was a burst of applause, which ended quickly as the people waited expectantly.

The great ceremonial fans which are carried before the Holy Father when he is seated on his portable throne appeared, and then the portable throne itself, the *sedia gestatoria,* was seen, moving along between two rows of mitred prelates into the dazzling brightness of the portico of the Basilica. The lights of a battery of electric lamps, placed high up near the ceiling of the portico, were focused upon the Holy Father, and showed him kneeling in prayer, unmoving, deeply touched by the solemnity of the occasion, and somewhat paler than usual.

Some journalists tried to explain this unusual and pronounced seriousness of mien in the Holy Father in terms of a preoccupation with the riots which the Communist labor groups tried to start down by the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. Frankly, we did not find their reasons convincing.

Never before had we realized the vanity of all human affairs as we did at that moment. All the rumors about rioting and all the threats of violence were halted there at the foot of the steps that lead up to the Basilica. We felt that we had been taken up from the things of this world and brought to a point where time stood still and where no one speaks except to God. All things

[1] Impressions of the occasion communicated to *The American Ecclesiastical Review* by one of the priest-sacristans of St. Peter's.

else faded before the great love and the powerful strength of a father who was opening the only doorway of salvation for his children, for those who stood near him and for those far away.

The journalists were wrong. Those tired lines on his face, brought into sharp focus in the bright lights of the portico, were signs, not of preoccupation, but of suffering. They did not manifest any anger, but rather a living and powerful desire for the year of the great return and the pardon, the year that was about to begin.

His voice was clear, almost metallic in quality, freighted with the power of prayer. The sound of his voice was stronger than that of the silver hammer upon the marble door.

After the third stroke of the hammer, the Holy Door moved, swayed a moment, and then fell back. The Holy Father knelt, then, rising, he crossed the threshold. The Cardinals, the bishops, the pontifical dignitaries, and the rest of those who had assisted at this never-to-be-forgotten scene came in after him.

A tremendous ovation from every corner of the crowded Basilica greeted the Holy Father as he passed through the throng. We knelt for his blessing as he drew near. When we stood up again, we could see him no longer.

The great bells rang, and the white doves were set free to fly off into the sky. Side by side with the faithful from every land, we knelt, and then passed through the Holy Door.

Aperite portas quia nobiscum Deus, the Pontiff had said. God is truly with us.

ANTONIO CARETTA

Basilica of St. Peter
Vatican City

ARDOR FOR GOD

Nothing provokes the Holy Spirit of God, Who is the fire of the love of God, more than the lukewarmness with which we allow His grace and mercies to pass by us, and to pass by us unperceived. Ask, then, of the Holy Spirit of God to give you light to know Him, to know His presence, to be conscious of His indwelling in your hearts.

—Cardinal Manning, in *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (New York: Kenedy, no date), p. 35.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF ST. AMBROSE

The great bishop of Milan, the former imperial functionary, schooled in the traditions of Roman statecraft, with his ability to get to the basic facts of a situation and work out from them a solid diplomatic policy, is one of the greatest champions of the independence of the Church, and at the same time one of the clearest exponents, by his actions, of the practical way in which relations between Church and State can be handled for the benefit of both organizations. His was a somewhat different and broader problem than were those of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom and it is to him that later leaders have looked for guidance rather than to the other two.

The conflict of St. Basil the Great was with the emperor Valens and his Pretorian Prefect Modestus. From it he emerges as one of the classic type of churchman who resists the usurpations of the State. Here again, as had happened before in the Orient, the question was whether and to what extent the emperor could interfere in matters of Faith.

St. Gregory of Nazianz has preserved for us[1] the dialogue of St. Basil with Modestus, a fanatic and cruel Arian who had placed twenty-four ecclesiastics on a vessel at Constantinople and then had caused it to be set afire so that they were burned alive.

Threatened with exile, the common punishment for those who opposed the secular power at that period, St. Basil answered: "I belong to no one place. This earth where I stand is not mine. Into whatsoever country I may be led, I shall be at home. Rather should I say that all the earth belongs to God, and I consider that wherever I am, I am, as it were, a stranger and a pilgrim."

Modestus exclaimed: "No one has ever, until this day, spoken to me so freely!"

St. Basil retorted: "Perhaps it is because you have never encountered a bishop."

The upshot of it all was that Valens had to give up his plans and leave St. Basil in his see. Not only did Valens make peace with the bishop but he later entrusted him with a mission to Armenia. The opposition of the staunch churchman to the attempts

[1] Cf. St. Gregory of Nazianz, *Orat.* XLIII, 48-51; *MPG,* XXXVI, 493.

of the secular power to intrude itself into the domain of the Church proved successful in this instance, at least.

This was a period in which the concepts which permeated the Christian mind regarding the independence of the Church were expressed by facts rather than in theoretical treatises. While minds in the Church were still engrossed in the discussions on the dogmas of the Trinity and of the Incarnation there was little time for them to set down in extended and clearly thought-out treatises the ideas on independence which remained from the previous period when by reason of the persecutions and the extra-legal position of the Church it was clear to all that it was a society separate from and completely distinct from the State.

Despite the servility of a considerable part of the hierarchy at the time in the Orient there still seems to have been a majority who sided with St. Basil in his opposition to the emperor's intrusions into the ecclesiastical field. Had there not been, it is hardly to be supposed that his opposition to Valens and Modestus would have been so successful.

The case of St. John Chrysostom presents less of the elements of a direct conflict between Church and State and more of the aspect of a squabble between churchmen with one side making use of secular support to achieve its ends. The element of interference by the State appears in the action of the eunuch, Eutropius, the all-powerful minister of the weak Arcadius, who attempted to take away from the churches the traditional "right of asylum."

St. John resisted Eutropius on this point, even though the minister had been instrumental in getting him elected to the see of Constantinople. Eutropius himself, however, was glad enough to make use of that right which he had almost succeeded in destroying, when he fell from favor and had to seek refuge in the church where St. John received him.[2]

Eudoxia, the empress, who became all-powerful on the fall of Eutropius and who had been vexed at the sermons in which St. John reproved her unjust expropriation of the property of a poor widow, was glad enough of the oportunity offered by the complaints of Theophilus of Alexandria to support this latter and his irregular synod which voted the deposition of St. John from his see.

[2] Cf. St. John Chrysostom, *MPG*, LII, 391-414.

When the Great Brothers, driven from Egypt by Theophilus, came to Constantinople St. John gave them hospitality, without however receiving them into his communion. Invoked by these fugitives, the court summoned Theophilus to come and justify himself before the bishop of Constantinople, St. John. Theophilus, canny as he was, did not come at once, but sent St. Epiphanius ahead to prepare the way by accusing St. John of Origenism, the same charge which he had made against the Great Brothers. The falseness of the accusation was so evident that St. Epiphanius soon perceived it himself and withdrew from the case, but the opportunity awaited by the empress and the rich widows who had been offended by the sermons of St. John was presented and when Theophilus finally arrived in Constantinople he was, with the support of those who were discontented there with St. John, able to appear the accuser rather than the accused.

All of this, however, appears rather as a conflict between the Patriarch of Alexandria and that of Constantinople who had dared to show hospitality to men whom the former had driven from his territory. The secular power comes into the scene rather as a supernumerary to lend some background color and to rejoice at the downfall of one who had proved troublesome to the consciences of the wealthy.

Real problems as to the relations between Church and State arose for St. Ambrose of Milan under the emperor Gratian (375-83), under the regency of the empress Justine (383-88) in the name of her son Valentinian II (375-92), and under emperor Theodosius (379-95), who from 388, after the defeat and death of Maximus (383-88), governed the whole empire, West as well as East.

Son of the Pretorian Prefect of Gaul, Ambrose, after the death of his father, was taken by his mother to Rome where he received an excellent education in the humanities. Entering upon a career of law he practiced for a time and then, still youthful, entered the government service. He became Pretorian Prefect of Italy, and, in 373, Governor of Liguria and Aemilia with the title of Consul and a palace in Milan.

It was while he was Governor, residing in Milan, that Auxentius, the bishop of Milan, died and a bitter dispute broke out between the Catholics and the Arians as to his successor. Mov-

ing in to maintain order Ambrose addressed the congregation which was seething with excitement and with the resentments of one party against the other. It was while he was speaking, exhorting the people to be calm, that a voice cried out "Ambrose bishop," and was taken up by the throng.

Nothing, perhaps, was farther from the mind of this imperial functionary who was in the midst of a brilliant civil career than that he should resign from his post of Governor and assume the mitre. Still, the popular demand and the tenseness of the situation was such that this seemed the best course to pursue, especially since the bishops, whose duty it was to elect a successor to Auxentius, and the emperor himself agreed that Ambrose should accept the post of bishop of Milan. He, therefore, submitted to the demands and received baptism, for, like many of his time, though he had been given a Christian education he had never yet been baptized, and the whole course of orders of the Christian Church.[3]

St. Ambrose was the confidant of the young Gratian who moved from Trier to Milan to take advantage of the counsels of the bishop. Because of his previous experience the bishop was able to join to his episcopal authority a political ability which had been proved by the test of practical results. For the youthful emperor, with his lack of experience and his tender conscience, the opportunity to converse with such an adviser could not have been better found and they became intimate friends. The conduct of the younger man which till then had been weak and hesitating took on a consistency and a firmness which is evidenced by his legislation. The action of Ambrose appears most clearly, however, in several measures of a religious character which had the purpose of liberating the Church from certain provisions of the law which still impeded its progress and in the removal from official acts of all that still savored of the old idolatry.[4]

The most important of these measures were the suppression of the revenues, grants and immunities which until then had been allowed to the colleges of pagan priests and to the Vestal Virgins, and the order to remove from the Senate chamber at Rome the statute of the goddess of Victory, which was the object of especial veneration by the senators who had remained pagan.

[3] Cf. *Vita Ambrosii, MPL,* XIV, 27-46, also F. Cayre, *Précis de Patrologie,* I, 508 ff.

[4] Cf. A. De Broglie, *Saint Ambroise,* pp. 37 ff.

Gratian was assassinated in Gaul, whither he had gone, in 383, to put down an uprising. Maximus usurped the power as against Valentinian II, who though still a child had been associated with himself in the empire by Gratian. The empress Justine, his mother, who had fled to Sirmium with the young prince, returned to demand the support of St. Ambrose in obtaining at least an agreement with Maximus whereby the power would be divided between Maximus and Valentinian II. Willing to be of assistance, St. Ambrose went to Trier that winter and by diplomatic delays gained time for Justine to fortify the Alps and thus save, at least temporarily, Italy for her son.

It was during his absence on this mission that a serious question developed at Rome. Profiting by the change in the regime the die-hard pagans attempted to restore the Altar of the goddess of Victory to its old place in the Senate Chamber. Symmachus, the Prefect, became the spokesman of those who wanted to raise once again the pagan altar, and using all his ability as a rhetorician he composed a report which, by its eloquence and its cleverness, seemed to impose upon the court a duty to accede to the demands of the pagan party.

On his return from the mission to Trier St. Ambrose found that the sentiment of the court was such that it appeared that permission would be granted for the restoration of the old pagan altar. It was then that he wrote his famous letters to Valentinian II which with biting irony cut to bits the clever arguments of Symmachus and won the decision of the emperor when the case finally came up for discussion.[5]

Another danger, however, and a more serious one, arose unexpectedly when Justine, an Arian at heart and surrounded by Arians whom she had brought with her from Sirmium to Milan, demanded for her protégés the Portian basilica on the outskirts of the city. St. Ambrose met this attempt by the civil power to take over ecclesiastical property with a refusal which was as definite as it was courteous.

Not satisfied with this, the Arians tried a month later to seize by force the new basilica which stood within the city walls. A violent reaction on the part of the people drove the troops back. A year later St. Ambrose was again asked to give over certain

[5] Cf. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* 17, 18; *MPL*, XVI, 961-82.

churches to the Arians. On his refusal he was asked to leave the city. A certain Mercurius, called also Auxentius, like Ambrose' predecessor, and an open Arian, was raised up as a competitor to him.

Fearing that an attempt would be made to seize the church by force during the Easter celebration St. Ambrose shut himself up in the Portian basilica with a strong body of determined members of the faithful and waited there as if under siege. The court dared not attempt, under the circumstances, to use force to take the church and it remained in the hands of the Catholics, followers of Ambrose.

It was during those days that St. Ambrose had those in the church with him pass the time in the singing of hymns.[6] It was then, too, that he pronounced his sermon "Against Auxentius," in which he used the famous expression: *Imperator intra Ecclesiam et non supra Ecclesiam est.* The emperor is a member of the Church and not superior to the Church.[7]

Providentially, too, at this time the relics of Saints Gervase and Protase were discovered and the popular favor which accrued to St. Ambrose at this discovery and at the miracles which took place during their removal for reburial finally obliged the empress to abandon her project to take the churches from St. Ambrose' control. As a matter of fact, she even found it expedient, by the following year, to make her peace with the Saint and to entrust to him another mission of diplomatic character to Maximus.

The usurper had begun to play the role of protector of the Catholics, and was showing an extreme zeal, perhaps in the hope of winning their support for his ambitions to empire. An example of his excessive zeal was his putting to death the heretic Priscillian in Spain and his threats to the empress Justine in Italy, who was involved on the side of the Arians in their controversy with the Catholics.

Recognizing the hypocrisy of the pretender, St. Ambrose addressed him firmly and frankly. The court at Milan, however, was displeased at St. Ambrose' approach and replaced him with another ambassador who was less forceful, not realizing that by

[6] Cf. St. Augustine, *Conf.*, IX, c. 7, 15; *MPL*, XXII, 770.

[7] Cf. St. Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium*, 36; *MPL*, XVI, 1018.

that very act it was revealing to Maximus the weak position of Valentinian II. Quick to see it, Maximus invaded Italy at once.

It was Theodosius who finally intervened, defeated Maximus at Aquileia in 388, and restored to his throne Valentinian II who had fled with his mother to Theodosius for safety before the oncoming armies of Maximus. At the death of Justine the young emperor Valentinian II was only too happy to have at his side such an experienced counsellor and statesman as St. Ambrose.

With Theodosius St. Ambrose also had very close and confidential relations. The emperor and the bishop were well in accord, at least as to the principles which should govern the place of the Church in a Christian State. On occasion, it is true, Theodosius forgot; but St. Ambrose had the courage to remind him of those principles, and after a brief crisis he ended by being heard.

Thus, in 390, certain imperial functionaries were slain in an uprising in Thessalonica. Theodosius ordered severe reprisals and several thousands were slain. St. Ambrose left Milan and wrote to the emperor reproaching him for the crime and inviting him to do penance, under threat of excommunication, a thing unheard of until that time, even though the empire had been Christian for three quarters of a century.[8]

Even St. Basil had not refused communion to Valens.[9] Profound, then, was the impression when people saw the emperor yield to the ecclesiastical discipline and do penance publicly, prostrated before the congregation of faithful who prayed for him and were more disposed to weep seeing the humbling of the imperial majesty than to fear that they might irritate it by some fault. Theodoretus[10] tells how St. Ambrose stopped the emperor at the door of the church and how eight months passed before he submitted to the discipline. Whether or not all that is exact, it does appear that the emperor did penance at the demand of St. Ambrose who at that moment appeared not only as the vindicator of the rights of the Church but also as the asserter of the collective conscience of mankind against the terrible slaughter which the emperor had ordered.

[8] Cf. P. Batiffol, *Le Siége Apostolique*, pp. 73 ff.

[9] Cf. St. Gregory of Nazianz, *Orat.* XLIII, 52-53; *MPG*, XXXVI, 493.

[10] Cf. Theodoretus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 5, 17; *MPG*, LXXXII, 1231.

In truth, St. Ambrose is the great Doctor of the Independence as well as of the Unity of the Church. More than any other who has taught concerning the independence of the Church he was able to exercise a powerful influence in the political order at a time when the question of relations between Church and State was most acute. The empire was just getting used to the feeling of being Christian and the problem of relation between the spiritual and the temporal was beginning to make itself felt in a very real sense in his day. Combining the experience both of the man of state and of the man of the Church, St. Ambrose was in a particularly good position to interpret the one to the other and to find a way whereby they could walk in common accord under their common Master.

The first principle which he sustained and succeeded in impressing upon the emperors with whom he dealt, especially upon Theodosius, was that the Church is, in its field, independent of the State. Constantine had enacted several laws which favored the Church, but he had never had at his side a bishop who would trace with firm hand the extent of his duties as Christian emperor. The two Eusebiuses had rather, invited him to mix into questions which were primarily religious.

Later, it is true, St. Athanasius and St. Basil raised their voices in protest against the policies of Constantius II and of Valens, but their success was short-lived and in the East ecclesiastical affairs remained more completely subject to the whims of the emperor than was good for the Church. The tradition there was far more in keeping with that of the previous period when the pagan emperor was head of religion as well as of civil affairs.

In the West, St. Hilary of Poitiers had protested forcefully against intrusions by the emperor into ecclesiastical matters,[11] but it remained for St. Ambrose to make himself heard and to cause the principle of the independence of the Church to be admitted not only in the general sense in which it had already been recognized by Constantine and by Valentinian I, but also in its more extensive ramifications.

St. Ambrose began by making a clear distinction between the State (*respublica*) and the Church (*religio*). The latter, he asserted, has a right to be free, not merely in questions of faith (*causa*

[11] In the *Contra Constantium*, see P. Batiffol, *Le Siége Apostolique*, p. 52.

fidei) but also in the persons of its representatives (*sacerdotium*) and in its hierachy (*ordo ecclesiasticus*). The State must not only not interfere to decide questions of faith but it must also not interfere with the choice of the officers of the Church and with their official acts.

This means, for St. Ambrose, that the Church shall be governed by its own *jus ecclesiasticum*, its *jus sacerdotale*.[12] As a practical matter, bishops are to be judged only by their fellow bishops. Furthermore, when a question of faith arises the emperors themselves are subject to the *jus ecclesiasticum* and to the decisions of the officers of the Church of which they, too, are members.[13]

As a further consequence, the churches, the religious edifices, are withdrawn from the jurisdiction and power of the emperors. They cannot dispose of them as they can of other public buildings. While they might have done so while the empire was pagan and they were the heads of religion as well as of civil affairs, they can no longer do so when religion has been organized as an independent society subject to its own head. Hence, St. Ambrose writes: *Ea quae sunt divina imperatoriae potestati non sunt subjecta*, Things which are divine are not subject to imperial power;[14] and: *Ad imperatorem palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesiae*, To the emperor belong the palaces, to the priest the churches.[15]

In the mind of St. Ambrose there is another principle which governs the relation of Church and State. This principle is that the Church is the guardian of morals. It has the right and the duty to bring into subjection to itself everyone in the world, including the emperor. His action in regard to the slaughter in Thessalonica shows how the Church can with profit make use of its spiritual arms against the emperor by excommunicating him, even though the question is not specifically one of religion, but is rather one of general moral conduct of the sovereign toward his subjects. This indirect authority of the Church over the emperor has nothing whatsoever, of course, to do with the internal con-

[12] Cf. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, pp. 61 f.

[13] Cf. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* 21, 4; *MPL*, XVI, 1004: "In causa fidei, in causa inquam, fidei, episcopos solere de imperatoribus christianis, non imperatores de episcopis judicare."

[14] Cf. St. Ambrose, *Ep.* 20, 8; *MPL*, XVI, 997.

[15] Cf. St. Ambrose, *ibid.* 19; *MPL*, XVI, 999.

stitution of the State, but rather aims to protect the citizens who still remain subject to the power of the emperor.

St. Ambrose mentions that the Jewish priesthood conferred the royal honor, but does not demand any similar right for the Christian priesthood. What he seeks to do is to impose a limit upon the omnipotence of the Roman State, which could so easily degenerate into tyranny. Against the excessive power of the emperor he opposes another power, strong enough, though without arms, to put a check-rein of morals upon the emperor's power and to oblige him to confess his wrong-doing.[16] This was not an attempt on the part of St. Ambrose to attain a position of political dominance, but rather an attempt to express in practice the concept which he had already expressed in words: *Imperator intra Ecclesiam et non supra Ecclesiam est.*

A further principle of St. Ambrose is that the Church has a right to protection from the State. In consequence, he felt that the state could not refuse to favor the Church, while it was obliged to refuse its favors to other cults, since error cannot, logically, have the same rights as truth. In fact, he obtained for the Church important privileges which were refused to others. Paganism itself was deprived of its former official status and practically condemned to disappear as a religious group.

Individual liberty, however, was not to be infringed. St. Ambrose reproved even the "legal" violence of which the heretic Priscillian was a victim under Maximus. He reproved the shedding of blood in a quarrel which of its nature was religious.[17] For the conversion of the Arians, with whom he had several conflicts and whose attempt to take over churches subject to his jurisdiction he resisted boldly, he counted rather upon the intellectual and moral action of his Catholics.[18] They were prevented from interfering with churches belonging to his people, not forced to join in submission to him.

Even in regard to the pagans, many of whom had remained in the Roman administrative service, he showed himself kindly disposed and on more than one occasion was ready and willing to be

[16] Cf. P. De Labriolle, *Saint Ambroise,* pp. 23 f.
[17] Cf. St. Ambrose, *Ep. 26, 3*; *MPL,* XVI, 1042.
[18] Cf. St. Ambrose, *De fide 3,* 11, 89; *MPL,* XVI, 579.

of service to them,[19] although he did resist sharply the attempts of Symmachus to restore the altar of Victory in the Senate Chamber.

In his principles, then, St. Ambrose was clear, precise, and logical. The Church, for him, had been set up as a distinct society with its own head and its own rights. It was to be independent of the State in matters of Faith and in matters of its own government. It was to safeguard the moral order and to punish in its own way those who transgressed that order, be they commoners or emperors. It was to be recognized as the only religious organization functioning in the State, though individuals were to be safeguarded in their consciences and were to be led, not forced against their will into membership in that organization, be they heretics or pagans.

Firm yet moderate in his approach, the great bishop of Milan, with the Roman genius for assessing a situation and working out a solution for the difficulties involved therein, demonstrated a way in which the two organizations set up by God for the guidance and assistance of mankind could get along together peacefully and work together for the benefit of the citizens of each of these two Cities.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[19] Cf. De Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS

The Church never mingles in politics, but she teaches the way of highest morality in everything. When her sacred interests are attacked, even if all the emperors, kings, presidents and governors of the whole world opposed her, she would tell them, as she has told their predecessors and as she will tell their successors: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

—Cardinal O'Connell, in his sermon, "The Power of the Holy Name," in *Sermons and Addresses of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell* (Boston: Pilot Publishing Co., 1922), VI, 5.

THE PARISH CENSUS-LIST AND MEMBERSHIP IN THE TRUE CHURCH

Since the middle of the sixteenth century, the question of the possibility that occult heretics or infidels might be really members of the Catholic Church has been discussed and disputed among theologians. Although St. Robert Bellarmine was by no means the first writer to have taught explicitly that these occult heretics and infidels could be members of the Church, he was the first to have assembled the battery of theological proofs usually employed by subsequent writers in favor of this thesis.[1] The arguments against St. Robert's teaching on this point were assembled and arranged by Suarez, Tanner, Wiggers, and Sylvius.[2] Apart from a distinction suggested by Peter Dens during the eighteenth century and a definite contribution by the late Cardinal Billot,[3] there has been astonishingly little progress in the treatment of this question since the middle of the seventeenth century.

[1] The thesis had previously been defended by Thomas Netter of Walden, John Driedo, Peter Soto, and Melchior Cano, among others. Cf. Netter, *Antiquitatum fidei catholicae doctrinale,* Lib. II, a. 2, in the Blanciotti edition (Venice, 1758), I, 292; Driedo, *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus,* Lib. IV, c. 2, part 2 (Louvain, 1533), p. 517; Soto, *Assertio catholicae fidei circa articulos confessionis nomine illustrissimi Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per legatos eius Concilio Tridentino,* the chapter *De ecclesia;* Cano, *De locis theologicis,* Lib. IV, c. 2, in the *Opera theologica* (Rome, 1900), I, 201.

[2] Cf. Suarez, *De fide,* disp. 9, sect. 1. This ninth disputation of Suarez' treatise *De fide* deals with the Church. The teaching referred to in this article is to be found in his *Opus de triplici virtute theologica* (Lyons, 1621), pp. 156 ff. Cf. Tanner, *Theologia scholastica* (Ingolstadt, 1627), III, column 136; Wiggers, *Tractatus de ecclesia,* in his *Commentaria de virtutibus theologicis* (Louvain, 1689), pp. 110 ff.; Sylvius, *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis cum nostris haereticis,* Lib. III, q. 1, articles 2, 3, and 7, in Sylvius' *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 236 ff.

[3] Dens tried to resolve the problem in terms of a distinction between an occult denial of the faith which was merely internal and one which was outwardly expressed. Cardinal Billot, more perfectly than any theologian before his time, explained membership in the Church in function of the baptismal character. Cf. Dens, *Theologia ad usum seminariorum et sacrae theologiae alumnorum,* 10th edition (Malines, 1880), II, 361; Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* 5th edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), I, 288 ff.

There is, nevertheless, a definite and highly important reason why the priests of our own time should be very much interested in this question. What seems to be the paramount effort of the anti-Christian forces of our own time is directed towards lessening the respect and affection of Catholics for the social organization of the Church as St. Robert Bellarmine described it in his definition of the Church and as he set out to explain it in the course of his book *De ecclesia militante*. People are always being led to imagine that there is some other sort of corporate entity which in one way or another is supposed to stand behind the strictly and completely visible, organized Catholic Church, and which is supposed to be deserving of a man's social loyalty in the supernatural order more completely than the visible organization.

Occasionally this effort takes the crass form of a declaration that preference for the visible Church over what is supposed to be an invisible Church constitutes a kind of evil.[4] In this, or in some less atrociously erroneous guise, however, the tendency is to decrease or to play down any actual affection for the kind of organization which shows up on the curate's census book.

Now, to put the matter in plain and colloquial English, the question about the possibility that occult heretics may be members of the Catholic Church, the true Church of Jesus Christ, has to do with the accuracy of the parish census report as a listing of the members of the true Church on earth. St. Robert Bellarmine has described the Church militant of the New Testament as a society whose entire membership in any given locality can be known and set down in a census register. He holds that such a group, composed of individuals whose names could be recorded by any diligent assistant, would actually constitute the true Church, the true kingdom of God on earth, in any particular section of the world.

St. Robert teaches, in other words, that a man is actually a part or member of the Catholic Church if, and only if, he possesses those factors which the older theologians designated as the outward, or bodily, or visible, bond of ecclesiastical unity.[5] Recognizing the fact that the inward bond, which is made up of faith, hope, charity, and other benefits conferred by the Holy Ghost, operates and actually belongs within the framework of the true

[4] Cf. Watkin's remarks about "ecclesiastical materialism," in *The Catholic Centre* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1943), pp. 139 ff.

[5] Cf. *De ecclesia militante*, c. 2.

Church, he nevertheless refused to concede that possession of these qualities was requisite for membership in the Church.

Sylvius, on the other hand ,was convinced that both the outward bond of unity and at least the possession of true faith from the inward bond were requisite in order to constitute a man as a member of the true Church.[6] Thus, according to the theory which Sylvius developed so perfectly the curate's census book would not be an accurate register of the membership of the Catholic Church within the area it attempts to cover. A person who could produce a baptismal certificate, who had never publicly repudiated either his Catholic faith or his Catholic allegiance, and who was not an *excommunicatus vitandus* would not necessarily be a member of the true Church. He would have lost his membership in the event that he had destroyed his faith by a secret or even a merely mental sin against this virtue.

The man who follows Sylvius on this point thus holds that the census book or register holds the names of all the members of the Church in any given place, but that it may contain names of non-members also. Since, according to that theory, a man may pass from the status of a member to that of a non-member by the performance of a secret or even of a merely mental act, it follows that in any individual case the man who seeks to record the membership of the Church within a definite area can never be completely sure that his listing is correct. And, in any large number of names, it would seem safe to conjecture that a few were incorrectly listed in the census registers.

Suarez, despite the manifest inconsistency of his teaching on this point, has held that faith and faith alone is requisite and sufficient to constitute a man as a member of the Church.[7] Thus his theory implies that there are members of the Church whose names are not on the books at all, and that there can be some names legitimately on the books but which actually belong to people who are non-members of the true Church. The curate can only list those people who have those factors which, together, constitute the outward bond of unity. It is, of course, possible that a person may have the true faith without having this outward bond. Such a person would, according to Suarez' teaching on this subject,

[6] Cf. Sylvius, *loc. cit.*

[7] Cf. Suarez, *loc. cit.*

actually be a member of the Church. At the same time, however, the curate could have no means of knowing that such a person's name belonged on the list he was preparing.

Thus, to sum this point up, St. Robert holds, in effect, that an accurate parish or diocesan census will list all and only the real members of the true Church within the area covered by the census. The theory of Sylvius means that such a listing would contain the names of all the members of the Church, but that the names of persons who are not members may possibly be included in the list along with those of the genuine members. The theory of Suarez implies that the list contains neither all nor only the names of real members of the true Church of Jesus Christ within this particular territory. The teachings of Suarez and of Sylvius both refuse to admit that a correctly made-up census register would accurately list the membership of the true Church of Jesus Christ within the region it was meant to cover. The people listed in the census register would not be a society at all, much less the true Church. They would be merely a group within which or around which the true Church lived and worked within the area of the census.

Such are the actual implications of these three theories. In the light of these implications, it is quite clear that the priests of our own day must not consider them merely as opinions of academic or of historical interest. There is nothing quite as important to us at the present time as to know what God has taught us about the Catholic Church of the census books. Is this census roll the list of the actual members of the true Church within a particular locality, or is it merely an approximate outline, within which or around which the true Church of the promises lives and operates? That is a question we should be in a position to answer.

And, in order to be able to make that answer intelligently, we should examine the theological proofs which have been employed to support the various theories on this subject since the question was first effectively proposed in the literature of scholastic theology. What is still the most famous battery of arguments on this point is to be found in the tenth chapter of St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante*.

In considering these arguments we must not forget to distinguish between St. Robert's contention that true internal faith is

not requisite for real membership in the Catholic Church and his teaching about the nature of the external bond of unity. The theological reasonings he employed to back up his doctrine that internal faith is not needed for membership in the Church have been regularly employed by ecclesiologists over the centuries. They retain their validity to this day.

On the other hand, the arguments and explanations St. Robert brought forward in defence of his opinion that the baptismal character itself is not required for membership in the Church have never had any important influence in the field of Catholic theology. St. Robert was convinced that any person who professed the true Catholic faith, who was admitted to the sacraments of the Church, and who acknowledged the spiritual authority of the legitimate ecclesiastical pastors, actually is a Catholic, even though that person lacks the baptismal character.[8] In the tenth chapter of the *De ecclesia militante* observations and arguments favoring this last contention are sometimes interspersed with proofs advanced in support of the thesis that occult heretics must be considered as members of the Church when they are joined to Our Lord by the external or bodily bond of unity. Fortunately, however, the weakness of the first set of reasonings in no way militates against the validity of the second.

The *De ecclesia militante* offers four basic proofs that occult heretics can be real members of the Catholic Church. The first of these is the argument from Scripture, in this case a demonstration from a text in the First Epistle of St. John.

St. John had written that

> . . . even now there are become many Antichrists: whereby we know that it is the last hour.
>
> They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us; but that they may be manifest, that they are not all of us.[9]

St. Robert was convinced that the people who "went out from us," according to St. John, were heretics, men who had inwardly denied the faith while still outwardly professing it. In this opinion, interestingly enough, the most modern Catholic commentary on this Epistle of St. John concurs.

[8] Cf. *De ecclesia militante*, c. 10. [9] *I John*, 2: 18-19.

St. Robert explained that the people who "went out from us" and who "were not of us" had, for a time, conserved their outward or bodily bond of unity with the Church while their inward or spiritual tie with the society of the disciples was broken. They "were not of us" in the sense that they had none of that inward bond of unity by which Our Lord meant that His followers should be joined to each other within His mystical Body. Nevertheless, at the very moment when these words were verified, the people concerned were still in a position where they had to be considered as members or parts of the true Church.

A man leaves or goes out of the Church only when he ceases to be a member. The people described by St. John were thus still parts or members of the Church before they left this company, even after they had ceased to possess the faith which is the basic element in the Church's spiritual bond of unity.

Although he readily admitted that St. Augustine had not always given exactly the same explanation of these words in the First Epistle of St. John, St. Robert showed that he had explained this passage in terms of occult heretics and their membership within the Church in many sections of his work, including those sections in which he commented on the Epistle as a whole.

The second proof which St. Robert offers for his thesis in the tenth chapter of the *De ecclesia militante* is based upon the common patristic contention that persons who are not members or parts of the Church can have no jurisdiction or authority within the Church. St. Robert then observes that if occult heretics have actually left the Church in the sense that they are no longer parts or members of its society, it would follow that they could have no real jurisdiction or authority within the Church of God. This position, he believed would destroy the very concept of jurisdiction within the Church itself. A Christian could never be absolutely certain that the man speaking to him and issuing commands by the authority of Christ is actually competent to teach or to exercise jurisdiction. This proof has been accepted and developed by most of the authors who have followed St. Robert in teaching that occult heretics can be members of the true Church. It has always been most difficult and embarassing for the opponents of this thesis. Actually, however, it is primarily

and essentially an aspect of the fourth proof adduced in this same tenth chapter of the *De ecclesia militante.*

St. Robert's third demonstration consists in the citation and the interpretation of a number of patristic texts which tend to confirm his thesis. The fourth proof is the demonstration from reason. The first section of this is merely an application of the significance of the term "body" to the question at hand. St. Robert contends that the human body, as it stands, contains many things which are not animated by the soul, which possess no degree of life whatsoever. He is convinced that the designation of the Church as the body of Christ admits the implication that there are parts of the Church which are utterly devoid of spiritual life, and which are thus without true inward divine faith.

The basic argument for St. Robert's position in respect to this controversy is to be found in the second part of his "proof from reason." He begins this section with the following still unrefuted statement: a denial that occult heretics can be members of the Church involves an admission that the Catholic position with reference to the visibility of the Church is not substantially different from that of the heretics themselves. He took cognizance of the fact that the Catholic controversialists in the dispute against the Protesants had, as a group, charged their opponents with describing the true Church as an invisible entity. He held that, if Catholics are to deny the possibility that occult heretics can be real members of the Church, they are forced logically to infer that their own writers taken as a whole had been in error on this point, and that the true Catholic position was actually that presented by the Lutherans and the Calvinists.

St. Robert adverted to the fact that the Protestant leaders themselves had spoken of certain outward and visible elements of the Church. They had their own "notes of the Church": the preaching of God's word and the administration of the sacraments. They taught that the true Church was to be found wherever these "notes" appeared.

Nevertheless, because they insisted that only good people, those in the state of grace, were really members of the true Church, and because they had to take cognizance of the fact that there are such people as hypocrites, the Catholic controversialists rightly reproached these men for describing the true Church as an invisi-

ble entity. From their principles, the Protestants were forced to teach that the true Church was actually a group whose membership could be known with certainty by God alone. The Catholic controversialists considered this implication a definite and manifest condemnation of the Protestant teaching about the Church.

As St. Robert points out, the Catholic writers were perfectly certain that the true *ecclesia Christi,* the kingdom of God on earth, was a company which men could recognize with perfect and objective certitude. They knew that obedience to the Church was something which God had made obligatory, and that there could be no such thing as rational or virtuous obedience to an invisible or uncertain authority.

In other words, St. Robert was convinced that, according to the actual teaching of Jesus Christ, His true Church is a company or a group which men can recognize or ascertain with infallible accuracy. It is a society whose members actually achieve and hold their position as members by the possession of completely manifest characteristics. He could see that if membership in the true Church depended upon the possession of inward faith, and thus upon the possession of an invisible characteristic, the entire Catholic stand in the theological controversies which had occupied the half century before the appearance of his own work would have been completely erroneous.

Oddly enough, the strength of St. Robert's position becomes apparent only when we compare his writing on this subject with the teachings of the most important theologians who hold the opposite opinion. Thus Suarez believes that no man can truly be called a member of the Church unless he is in some way joined to Our Lord by an act of the spiritual life.[10] In stating that principle, Suarez laid the foundation for most of the opposition St. Robert's thesis has encountered throughout the centuries.

Yet, when we examine that principle closely, we find that it is nothing more or less than an oblique statement of the conclusion Suarez was trying to draw out of it. What he presents as a self-evident principle is actually the very thesis he has set out to demonstrate.

His "ad hominem" argument against those who held that occult heretics could be members of the Church is likewise wide of the

[10] Cf. Suarez, *op. cit.,* p. 162.

mark. Suarez insisted that his opponents believed the baptismal character to be necessary for membership in the Church. Many of them did so believe, although St. Robert was not of this number. Suarez held that such persons were inconsistent when they denied that faith was requisite for membership in the Church on the ground that faith is something invisible. The baptismal character itself is, according to Suarez, something quite as invisible as inward faith itself.

Speaking on the same subject some years before Suarez wrote his treatise, Dominic Bannez had mentioned visible and invisible causes of union in the Church and had "included the invisible character under the name of the visible cause, that is, the sacrament." [11] For, although the baptismal character is invisible when considered simply by itself, it is definitely and completely recognizable in its cause. It is something which is produced necessarily and irrevocably in the reception of the visible sacrament of baptism. Faith is something which a man can destroy within himself, secretly or openly. No man who has once received the sacramental character can ever cast it away.

Thus, once we know that a man has been baptized, we know with certainty that he has the baptismal character. On the other hand, the knowledge that a man has been baptized or has made a public profession of faith in no way infallibly implies that he possesses the virtue of divine faith at this given moment. It is astonishing to see these two factors, faith and the baptismal character, rated as equally invisible in any work of theology.

Suarez had a very imperfect notion of the visibility of the Church. He described this visibility as the characteristic by which the true Church could be distinguished from the various congregations of Satan, in other words primarily as the property according to which the Church could be made manifest by a demonstration based on the notes of the Church. He believed that individual members of the Church could be recognized and designated as such with "a prudent judgment." The entire Church, however, as distinguished from its individual member, he considered recognizable with infallible accuracy.[12]

[11] *Scholastica commentaria in secundam secundae Angelici Doctoris D. Thomae,* in q. 1, a. 10 (Venice, 1588), col. 286.

[12] Cf. Suarez, *op. cit.,* sect. 8, p. 176.

The other opponents of St. Robert's thesis were scarcely more impressive than Suarez in their arguments on this point. Wiggers held that the dispute was mainly a matter of terminology. He believed that St. Robert's thesis was "more common," and also that it seemed "more perfectly in conformity with the writings of the ancients." When he came to explain his teaching, however, he insisted that occult heretics "seem to be members of the Church in an imperfect way, and, as it were, only analogically." All of his arguments actually go to support St. Robert's position.[13]

Sylvius defends his thesis with arguments from the nature of the Church, from Scripture, and from the writings of the Fathers. Actually the reasoning of this great theologian seems valid only as a demonstration of the necessity of the baptismal character for membership in the Church. He was quite correct in insisting that the mere profession of faith, apart from the baptismal character, could never suffice to make a man truly a member of the Church militant. He was quite incorrect, however, in insisting that internal faith was requisite for this purpose.

In defence of his own position, Sylvius had to teach that a man could be the head of the Church without being a member or a part of it.[14] Thereby he contradicted the common teaching that no man can have authority within the Church without being a part of this society.

He was compelled, moreover, to offer a strikingly inadequate explanation of the visibility of the Church. Sylvius taught that Catholics do not reproach the Protestant writers for making the Church invisible precisely because they made the possession of sanctifying grace a requisite for membership, but partly because they spoke of an invisible Church which consisted of the predestined, and again in part because their "notes of the Church" were inadequate.[15] In explaining the visibility of the Church, Sylvius constantly evades any real discussion of a society whose members are definitely and surely recognizable as such, claiming that it is enough to have a *bona fiducia,* as distinct from real certitude, about the identity of individual members of the true Church.[16]

[13] Cf. Wiggers, *loc. cit.*

[14] Cf. Sylvius, *op. cit.*, q. 1, a. 7, p. 243.

[15] Cf. *ibid.*, q. 2, a. 1, p. 254.

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, q. 2, a. 2, p. 256.

Patrick Murray offers two pontifical statements as indications in favor of his thesis, that occult heretics cannot be members of the Church.[17] The first is the famous passage from the *Ineffabilis Deus,* in which Pope Pius IX declares that those who think in their heart otherwise than in the way he has defined, should realize "that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck about the faith, and that they have fallen from the unity of the Church (*et ab unitate Ecclesiae deficisse*)."[18] The other document is the Bull *Cantate Domino,* issued by Pope Eugene IV. In this document the Pontiff writes that persons who dissent internally from the truths he has defined are denounced as alien or foreign from the body of Christ which is the Church.[19]

Neither the *Ineffabilis Deus* nor the *Cantate Domino* contains teaching pertinent to the question about the membership of occult heretics in the Catholic Church. Both of these documents insist that a man who commits a merely internal sin against the faith, and who destroys the virtue of divine faith within himself, has in some way cut himself off from the Church. When we say that faith is actually an element of one of the bonds of union within the Church, we necessarily imply all that either pontifical document has to say in this regard.

In order to defend his own position, Murray found himself compelled, in the final analysis, to deny the possibility of truly occult heresy. He believed that heresy necessarily manifests itself, and that thus there is no practical danger of teaching the existence of an invisible Church when one denies the possibility of membership of occult heretics within the true Church of Christ.[20] Thus Murray sought to resolve the problem by denying that the problem exists.

An examination of the arguments adduced by those theologians who, throughout the centuries, have denied that occult heretics can be members of the true Church brings to light a somewhat confused teaching about the visibility of the Church on the part of the men who have adopted this position. None of these theologians

[17] Cf. Murray, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Dublin, 1860), I, 202 f.

[18] *DB,* 1641.

[19] *DB,* 705.

[20] Cf. *Murray, op. cit.,* 195 f.

could admit that the names in a census book in a parish where the census is properly taken actually constitutes the membership roll of the true Church militant of the New Testament within the particular area covered by the census. All of them are forced to assert that the names on the census list constitute a group within which members of the true Church are to be found. Those who long ago agreed with Suarez would have to admit that the parish list would contain some members of the Church and some non-members, and also that some members of the Church in that particular territory would not be on the parish roll. The followers of Sylvius, on the other hand, would have to claim that all of the members of the Church militant of the New Testament within this locality are contained on a properly made-up parish census list, but that this list could also contain some non-members.

The men who could be listed in a parish census are the ones whom the world, and, for that matter the Catholics themselves, must recognize as the Catholic Church, the company over which the Roman Pontiff presides. If this particular company, as it stands, is not the kingdom of God on earth, then the attitudes of Suarez and Sylvius can be justified. But if the group subject to the Roman Pontiff in this world, the group actually known and recognized as the Catholic Church, really is the kingdom of God on earth, then, logically, it would appear that the thesis of St. Robert Bellarmine on the membership of occult heretics in the true Church of Jesus Christ should be accepted without question.

Obviously St. Robert's teaching that the baptismal character is not requisite for membership in the Church has no serious standing in current theological teaching. No man can be a member or a part of Our Lord's kingdom on earth without that God-given capacity for the Church's Eucharistic worship which we designate as the sacramental character of baptism. That character, however, is, in its cause, a complete visible reality. The man who possesses it is manifestly joined to Christ by the Church's outward bonds of unity. The visibility of the Church is, in the last analysis, definable only in terms of that outward bond.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

PREPARING FOR A MIXED MARRIAGE

Question: Before keeping company with a non-Catholic should a Catholic ascertain whether or not the non-Catholic will be willing to marry before a priest and to make the required promises?

Answer: Even though there is certainty that the non-Catholic will be willing to appear before a priest for marriage and to make the required promises, it is sinful for the Catholic to keep company with him, if there is a probability that it will lead to marriage, unless there are (or surely will be before the marriage) just and grave reasons for this particular marriage. The Church demands such reasons as one of the conditions for the granting of a dispensation for a mixed marriage, in addition to the promises and the assurance that they will be kept (Canon 1061). Moreover, the reasons must be morally good if the dispensation is to be licitly obtained. This qualification has been added because it not infrequently happens that the only adequate reason that can be adduced for the granting of a dispensation is "periculum matrimonii civilis." Now, while the Church is justified in granting a dispensation for a mixed marriage (as the lesser of two evils) because of such danger, it is not a morally good reason on the part of the two persons concerned, for it indicates in them a willingness to commit sin. Consequently in order that a Catholic may licitly keep company with a non-Catholic with any thought of future marriage, he must be certain that there is (or at least will be at the time of the marriage) a grave and lawful reason for contracting it, such as the *well-founded* hope of conversion of the non-Catholic party.

THE PRIVILEGE OF THE LITTLE OFFICE

Question: If a priest has the privilege of substituting the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin for the canonical hours, may he use it if he takes a trip of sixty miles and then makes the return trip on the same day? I am presuming that the trip is made *ratione officii,* according to the stipulation made by the Holy See when it grants this privilege. I myself believe that the fulfilment of the

condition that the journey must be one of at least 100 miles requires that the journey be made in one direction.

Answer: Since the ruling of the Holy See in granting this privilege stipulates merely that the priest make a journey of at least 100 miles *ratione officii,* it seems quite sufficient to make a journey of at least fifty miles with a return to the point of departure, as long as the priest travels both ways on the same day.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SSR.

POSITION OF SUB-DEACON AT THE *SANCTUS*

Question: There seems to be a lack of uniformity in the position of the sub-deacon at the *Sanctus* of Solemn Mass. In some places, he remains at the foot of the altar and in others he goes up to the left of the celebrant to recite the *Sanctus* with the latter along with the deacon. Which is the correct procedure?

Answer: The rubrics of the Missal (*Rit. serv.* VII, 11) direct the subdeacon to leave the foot of the altar and ascend to the left of the celebrant at the same time that the deacon goes to his right that priest and ministers may all three recite the *Sanctus* standing together.

Most liturgical authorities quote this as the correct procedure (cf. Martinucci, Lib. I, Cap. xii, 59; Fortescue, 117; *U. S.* [alias *Baltimore*] *Ceremonial,* Part III Chap. II Art. v. 26). All these, however, note a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites (Nov. 12, 1831) which allows the retention of the custom, where it exists, of the sub-deacon remaining at the foot of the altar, while celebrant and deacon recite the *Sanctus* as they stand together on the predella of the altar. Martinucci (*loc. cit.*), while noting the provision of this decree, is decidedly in favor of the exact observance of the rubric of the Missal.

The more correct practice, therefore, would be to have the subdeacon ascend to the predella to recite the *Sanctus* along with the celebrant and the deacon but the custom may be retained, where it exists, of having the sub-deacon remain at the foot of the altar at this moment of the Mass.

BLESSING WHEN TAKING HOLY COMMUNION TO THE SICK

Question: Before leaving the chapel with a ciborium for Communion to the sick, may a hospital chaplain give those present a blessing with the ciborium? No Ritual mentions this as to be done *before* the distribution of Holy Communion outside the chapel.

Answer: We know of no authority which permits benediction with the ciborium when the priest is leaving a chapel en route to the distribution of Holy Communion to the sick outside that chapel. It is the proper procedure when the priest returns from giving Holy Communion, just before he replaces the ciborium in the tabernacle. Benediction, simple or solemn, is always given at the end of a procession before the reposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

BENEDICTIO POST PARTUM IN THE PLURAL

Question: When several mothers receive together the blessing after childbirth, must the prayers be said for each individual or does it suffice to say them in the plural, having one mother hold the candle and take the end of the stole, when required?

Answer: We remember replying to a similar query some time ago to the effect that when several women receive together the *benedictio post partum,* the prayers may be said in the plural for all in common. We should have each candidate hold a lighted candle but we should think it sufficient for only the first one to take the end of the stole at the proper moment. This latter opinion is based on parity with a similar rubric in the case of Baptism at the time when the children are led to the font, the end of the stole resting on the first infant.

THE ASPERGES IN A SEMI-PUBLIC ORATORY

Question: May the *Asperges* be given in a semi-public oratory? The chapel which I have in mind is one which takes the place of an abbey church and serves as a chapel for the students attending the abbey school.

Answer: The *Codex Juris* (Canon 1193) provides that in a semi-public oratory, which is lawfully erected, all liturgical functions may be performed unless there is a contrary rubric or a prohibition of the Ordinary of the place. There is no obstacle on the part of the rubrics of the liturgical books and not likely to be any episcopal veto, forbidding the *Asperges* in a semi-public oratory, especially one such as that described by our correspondent as the chapel of an abbey church.

This ceremony of the sprinkling of the congregation with holy water before High Mass is of strict obligation only in cathedral and collegiate churches (S.R.C., 4051, 1). It seems, however, to be the universal practice in all parish churches in this country and the *U. S. (Baltimore) Ceremonial* presumes that it is to take place generally in all churches every Sunday (Part I, Chap. IX, Art 1, n.). There is no reason why the ceremony should not precede the Sunday High Mass also in semi-public oratories.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE SHEPHERD FOR CHRIST'S FLOCK

These, then, are the duties of a shepherd: to place himself as leader at the head of his flock, to provide proper food for it, to ward off dangers, to guard against insidious foes, to defend it against violence: in a word, to rule and govern it. Since therefore Peter has been placed as shepherd of the Christian flock he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed His blood. "Why has He shed His blood? To buy the sheep which He handed over to Peter and his successors."

And since all Christians must be closely united in the communion of one immutable faith, Christ the Lord, in virtue of His prayers, obtained for Peter that in the fulfilment of his office he should never fall away from the faith. "But I have asked for thee that thy faith fail not." Furthermore He commanded him to impart light and strength to his brethren as often as the need should arise, "Confirm thy brethren." He willed then that he whom He had designated as the foundation of the Church should be the defense of its faith.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical, *Satis cognitum,* issued June 20, 1896.

Book Reviews

GOD THE FATHER: MEDITATIONS. By Emile Guerry. Translated by A. H. C. Downes. New York: Sheed and Ward. Pp. xxxix + 184. $2.50.

In a well-ordered series of eighty-nine meditations, this worthy volume depicts the supernatural life of man as an ascending movement towards God the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. This movement is identified with the divinely-wrought economy wherein lies the substance, the fulfillment and the crown of Catholic living.

The dogma of God's Fatherhood is in truth the key to Catholic theology in its several traditional ramifications. No doctrine stands out more poignantly in Christ's teaching and example (pp. ix-x). It is the keystone whence the liturgy of the Church derives its warmth and majesty. The Fathers of the Church, in their own spirited appeals, never seem to weary of repeating that the Father of Jesus Christ, His Father by nature, has through the grace of adoption become our Father, towards Whom the Son and Holy Ghost, in Their own respective missions, seek to lead us through Themselves and by Themselves. The Fathers portray this selfsame dogma as fully steeped in the well-springs of Catholic Tradition.

From the viewpoint of content, Bishop Guerry has made the dogma of God's Fatherhood the focus about which all Catholic doctrines, moral principles, ascetical practices and liturgical functions are seen to rotate —the Trinity above all, the Incarnation, the Redemption, the supernatural life of the individual soul in its several phases, the Organic Church in which the supernatural life of the individual becomes socially orientated, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice or family prayer of the Whole Christ. The author has thus succeeded in providing a single profound and comprehensive view of Catholic life, ordered toward a realization of God's eternal plan, and culminating in the glory of the First Person of the Trinity.

The method chosen in the treatment of these many truths is one which would supply in outline form countless suggestions for thought. It attempts nothing in the nature of a commentary on the cited texts of Sacred Scripture. In his final purpose, the author aims to *elevate,* by setting before his reader the highest of all ideals—that which absorbed the totality of Our Blessed Lord's life, viz., the glory of the Father; to *liberate,* by purging away that egocentric attitude which is apt to invade the sincerest piety; and to *bring us peace,* because it engenders the certitude of the Fathers' boundless Love, Mercy and Goodness.

It is somewhat distressing to find the author entering upon an apology for this approach to things divine, and insisting that he recommends in his pages no new or dangerous devotion. Yet, in the light of modern Catholic devotional practice, his hesitation about emphasizing this forgotten side of our spiritual life is quite understandable. Lest any shade of doubt pervade the mind of his reader, he well establishes in his introductory remarks the doctrinal validity of special devotion to the Father, and its relation to cognate matters of Catholic thought (pp. xvi-xxvi).

As a source of spiritual wealth, this volume cannot be recommended too highly. Seldom has a work of spirituality been so deeply grounded in sound theological truth. Bishop Guerry has assisted his readers to rediscover in the Gospel the "true face" of God the Father. He has ably convinced his readers that in the worship of the Father we have no special or particular form of devotion, but quite simply, the true Christian piety, in a word, the Christian life. This life is the life of Christ in us, the life of the Son, drawing us by the communication of His own life of grace, and by the Holy Spirit, into a life of sonship achieved in wisdom and love, and towards the Father of Whom St. Thomas could write: *Pater qui est ultimum ad quod recurrimus.*

EDWARD F. DOWD

VADEMECUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. By Dominic M. Pruemmer, O.P. Sixth edition, edition by Engelbert M. Muench, O.P. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder and Co., 1947. P. xxiii + 586.

This sixth edition of the *Vademecum* compiled by Fr. Pruemmer as a compendium of his work on Moral Theology for the use of those who are to take examinations as well as for the use of confessors is but a reprint of the previous editions. Page after page, the text is the same, even to the mistakes, e.g. "alicuis" for "alicuius" in line 1 of p. 419.

Although the editor of the fifth and sixth editions has added an Appendix which is supposed to bring the work more up to date, the latest decision of the Holy See noticed there by this reviewer is dated 1939. Thus, one cannot expect to find in this edition of the *Vademecum* a mention of the faculty given to pastors to administer Confirmation, or of the decree on the custody of the Holy Eucharist. Likewise, there is no mention of absolution on airplanes, or of the decree with regard to Communists and those who associate with them. Nothing is to be found with regard to the form of Ordination, or with regard to the investigation of freedom of parties to marry. The amounts of indulgences which can be granted by Bishops and Archbishops are likewise

different now from those indicated in this edition of the *Vademecum.* Naturally, the most recent decision as to the meaning of the phrase "ab acatholicis nati" is not to be found in the work, either.

More serious is the neglect of the *Privilegium Fidei* cases which have been under discussion since 1924. Serious, too, is the omission of any discussion of *Quadragesima anno* and "Social Justice," although the *Vademecum* does contain a quotation or two from *Rerum Novarum.*

All in all, it would seem that anyone preparing for examinations or hearing confessions would do well, were he to use this *Vademecum,* to remember that there are several important points on which he will find no information here. It affords an apt illustration of the old saying that there is nothing so dangerous as a work in Moral Theology which is out of date.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

SECRETS OF THE INTERIOR LIFE. By Luis Martinez, D. D., Archbishop of Mexico. Translated by H. J. Beutler, C.M., S.T.L. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949. Pp. 207. $3.00.

What inspires men today to write spiritual books? The most painstaking research can unearth no new facts, nor is there room for theories that can be both novel and safe, for every tiniest step along the road that leads to God has already been mapped, described, and analysed, by the masters of the spiritual life. Perhaps men are encouraged to write spiritual treatises because they realize that modern men are troubled by the restlessness of the age which prompts them to mistake the novel for the better. Perhaps they write, not because they think that they can say anything new, but because of their confidence that they can say the old things in a new way. If they did not feel this they would not write: they would urge the worth of the old masters.

The Secrets of the Interior Life is novel neither in what it says, nor in the way it says what it has to say. Fr. Beutler was captivated by the beauty of the Spanish in which the original was written. "Surprised" that no one had attempted to give the works of Archbishop Martinez, popular in his own country, an English form, he set out on his "labour of love," often discouraged in his attempts "to give a fitting English dress to the exquisite Spanish of the Archbishop." If this book fails to meet with the response the translator hoped for, perhaps the explanation will be found in that discouragement: the original Spanish must have had something which has eluded the grasp of the translator.

The book is solid, full of wise things that have been said in every age and in nearly every tongue. . . . Insistence on the necessity of the interior life . . . detachment a *sine qua non* of that life . . . the disastrous effects of inordinate attachments . . . sorrow, and the part it plays in the interior life . . . prayer . . . contemplation. All these things are said in a way that will be perfectly intelligible to those who are familiar with the cloying sweetness that characterizes the language in which so many spiritual books are written. It will be like so many other books that they have read. For those who read *The Saturday Evening Post* it will offer yet another encouragement to leave spiritual literature to those who have fled the world by vow. Yet the jacket of this book says: ". . . This book . . . is not intended specifically for religious . . ."

Fr. Beutler's efforts will receive the tremendous reward that he looks for, and more. "If only one person is brought nearer to God . . . I shall feel amply rewarded." But those who will profit already have so much to read: those whom he hoped to reach—husbands, wives, mothers of families, he will not reach, because this book is written in an idiom too far removed from the language of the home and the office.

LAURENCE J. MCCAULEY, C.SS.R.

AS WE OUGHT. By Vincent P. McCorry, S.J. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Co., 1949. Pp. 236. $2.75

Before he gave us *Most Worthy of All Praise* Fr. Vincent McCorry's name was not generally known. After that delightful book, in which a smile lurked behind commonsense piety, people began to ask: "Who is this Father McCorry?" They were pleased to discover that he was comparatively young—that possibly there would be other books from his pen, as gay, as kindly, and as helpful. And there have been other books. In his latest, *As We Ought,* he addresses himself with engaging diffidence to a more formidable group of readers than he tackled in *Most Worthy of All Praise and Those Terrible Teens.* He writes for religious in general—for priests, Brothers and Sisters.

Those who have already been helped—and delighted—by this newcomer to the field of spiritual writers will not be disappointed with *As We Ought.* They will find in it the mixture as before, shrewd observations on religious life by a man who keeps his heart as wide open as his eyes. The book is not a spiritual classic. It will neither rouse the resentment he half fears, nor will it start a new school of asceticism. It is a companionable book, a friendly book, a book that will be as well